THE Lutheran Quarterly

lume IX FEBRUARY, 1957 Number 1

v.9
1957

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Hancock, Mich.

Trinity Seminary
Blair, Neb.

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume IX FEBRUARY, 1957 Number 1

CONTENTS

SOCIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
Harold Haas 3
THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION
Herbert Wolf 17
CHRISTIANITY AND THE TRUTH — *Paul L. Holmer* 33
COLLECTIONS OF LUTHER MEDALS IN AMERICA — *Otto L. Schreiber* 42
THE DEAD WOOD IN THEOLOGICAL DICTION — *Stan Carnarius* 50
EARLY LUTHERAN RELATIONS WITH THE EASTERN ORTHODOX
Berthold F. Korte 53
CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENT
Rebuttal on the Lord's Supper — *Olof H. Nelson* 60
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES
Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Paul Leo) — 63
Schlatter, *The Church in the New Testament Period* (J. W. Heikkinen) — 64
Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (R. T. Stamm) — 66
Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* (L. D. Docken) — 66
Sevenster & van Unnik, eds., *Studia Paulina* (E. E. Flack) — 68
Sparks, *The Formation of the New Testament* (J. W. Heikkinen) — 68
Metzger, *St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient* (J. H. Burtness) — 69
Parrot, *Nineveh and the Old Testament* (J. V. Halvorson) — 69
Barnekow et al., *Bibel, Bekännelse, Ämbete* (E. H. Wahlstrom) — 70
Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars* (H. J. Mumm) — 70
Laetsch, *Bible Commentary: The Minor Prophets* (J. M. Myers) — 72
Kraeling, *The Old Testament since the Reformation* (E. Mengers) — 73
Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* (J. V. Halvorson) — 74
Williams, *The Prophets, Pioneers to Christianity* (H. L. Creager) — 74
Davies et al., *The Twentieth Century Bible Commentary* (J. Reumann) — 75
Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* (G. F. Schott) — 76
Dillistone, *Christianity and Symbolism* (P. L. Holmer) — 77
Brown, *Subject and Object in Modern Theology* (C. W. Kegley) — 78
Baillie, *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought* (H. H. Ditmanson) — 79
Berdyaev, *Truth and Revelation* (M. J. Heinecken) — 80
Shaw, *Pulpit under the Sky* (H. A. Larsen) — 81
Carlson, *The Church and the Public Conscience* (K. H. Hertz) — 82
Esbjornson, *A Christian in Politics: Luther W. Youngdahl* (K. H. Hertz) — 83
Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (W. D. Allbeck) — 84
Boison, *Religion in Crisis and Culture* (D. Belgum) — 84
Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, Vol. VI, Pt. 1 (T. G. Tappert) — 85
Soper, *The Religions of Mankind* (H. W. Johnson) — 86
Jones, *Principles and Practice of Preaching* (A. J. Traver) — 86
Brunner, *The Great Invitation and Other Sermons* (H. F. Baughman) — 86
Acker, ed., *Wedding Addresses* (A. C. Rueter) — 87
Wynn, ed., *Sermons on Marriage and Family Life* (T. Heimarck) — 87
Jeffrey, ed., *The Sacramental Table* (L. O. Larson) — 88
Rein, *Adventures in Christian Stewardship* (C. J. Grimstvedt) — 88
McLoughlin, *Billy Sunday Was his Real Name* (A. R. Wentz) — 89
Loew, *Modern Rivals to Christian Faith* (J. H. Hanson) — 89
Brown, *The Significance of the Church* (J. H. Hanson) — 89
Hedley, *Religion on the Campus* (O. A. Bremer) — 91
Collins, *A History of Modern European Philosophy* (P. L. Holmer) — 92
Burnaby, *Christian Words and Christian Meanings* (M. J. Heinecken) — 93
Cochrane, *The Existentialist and God* (M. J. Heinecken) — 94
Saarnivaara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel* (R. H. Fischer) — 94

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

CONTRIBUTORS

HAROLD HAAS, who combined teaching of Sociology with his pastorate in St. John's Church, Jersey City, N. J., was recently elected executive secretary of the United Lutheran Church's Board of Social Missions.

HERBERT WOLF is pastor of University Lutheran Church (A.L.C.) and instructor in the department of Religion in Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

PAUL L. HOLMER is professor of Philosophy in the University of Minnesota.

OTTO L. SCHREIBER is pastor of Calvary Church (U.L.C.A.) in Jersey City, N. J., and the donor of the collections of Luther medals alluded to on p. 44.

STAN CARNERIUS is a member of the editorial staff of the Muhlenberg Press in Philadelphia, Pa.

BERTHOLD F. KORTE is pastor of Zion Church in Bellwood, Ill.

OLOF H. NELSON is a retired minister of the Augustana Church who now resides in Chicago.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are PAUL LEO, professor of the New Testament in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa; JACOB W. HEIKKINEN, professor of the New Testament in the seminary at Gettysburg, Pa.; RAYMOND T. STAMM, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; E. E. FLACK, professor of the New Testament in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; JAMES H. BURTNESS, instructor in Theology in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; J. V. HALVORSON, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; ERIC H. WAHLSTROM, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; HARRY J. MUMM, professor of the New Testament in the Pacific Seminary, Berkeley, Calif.; JACOB M. MYERS, professor of the Old Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; ETHAN MENGERS, professor of the Old Testament in Trinity Seminary, Blair, Neb.; HAROLD L. CREAGER, professor of the Old Testament in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; JOHN REUMANN, assistant professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; GEORGE F. SCHOTT, JR., professor of Systematic Theology in the Southern Seminary; CHARLES W. KEGLEY, professor of Philosophy in Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y.; HAROLD H. DITMANSON, professor of Religion in St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.; MARTIN J. HEINECKEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; HERMAN A. LARSEN, professor of History in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.; KARL H. HERTZ, professor of Sociology in Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio; WILLARD D. ALLBECK, professor of Church History in Hamma Divinity School; DAVID BELGUM, professor of Counseling in the Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.; H. W. JOHNSON, professor of the Philosophy of Religion in Augustana Seminary; AMOS J. TRAVER, professor of Practical Theology in Hamma Divinity School; A. C. RUETER, pastor of Bethany Church in Tulsa, Okla.; THEODORE HEIMARCK, pastor of the Church of the Good Shepherd in Minneapolis, Minn.; LOWELL O. LARSON, pastor of First Church in Morris, Minn.; ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, visiting professor of Church History in the Southern Seminary; JAMES H. HANSON, pastor of American Lutheran Church (E.L.C.) in Hardin, Mont.; OTTO A. BREMER, pastor to Lutheran students in Berkeley, Calif.; ROBERT H. FISCHER, professor of Church History in the Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Ill.

16878

Sociological Implications for Christian Education

By Harold Haas

IN dealing with social behavior one is always faced with several inherent difficulties. It is well to recognize these at the outset. First, while research in sociology continues apace, its subject matter is so broad and complex as to be as yet (if ever) irreducible to fundamental theories or laws. Second, while prediction is a function of any science, one would have to be utterly rash to choose with any degree of certainty among the possible aternatives for human social behavior. Third, it is necessary to qualify all that is said by assuming that there will be no general war. With the degree of destructiveness now possible in war, it is impossible to guess what would be the nature of social life should such a tragic situation eventuate.

Ours is a society in transition: *from what* can be described, *to what* is the problem. The temptation is strong to hold to the security of describing what has been, but our purpose is served only by willingness to take the risk of looking ahead. Because of the abundance of material, the problem of selection is a difficult one. Three major areas have been chosen for sketchy delineation. Due to its effect on our whole way of life, the new technological revolution has been described. Since Christian education is directed to people, a few demographic trends have been set forth. By way of illustration of the fact that Christian education must be given in a milieu of social problems, several of these important problems have been indicated. I shall not try to spell out all the implications for Christian education, but I shall seek to point out what social developments have such implications.

The Technological Revolution

The twin facts of industrialization and urbanization transformed American society within the lifetime of some who are still living. The source of many of the changes in social interaction and organization is to be found here. Without falling into the Marxian fallacy of economic

determinism, we can still recognize the inter-relatedness of all the basic elements of a culture and the profound importance of economic change.

While sometimes the Industrial Revolution is described as a thing of the past, something that has essentially run its course, there are enough factors in existence today to indicate that we are on the verge of a totally new technological revolution. If this comes to fruition, the effects on our social life may be as great as those of the first Industrial Revolution.

Within recent years the word "automation" has come into common vogue. The significance of this development is not that we can have a few more machines to do more work but lies in the *kind* of machines that are possible. Automation, growing out of new discoveries in electronics, is in the direction of cybernetics—machines that "think." Louis N. Ridenour has written: "Without quite realizing it explicitly, we have for some decades been building machines whose fundamental purpose is less to do work than to order, arrange, and supervise it, machines whose stock in trade is not energy but information."[1] In even more striking fashion, the same author writes:

> Professor Norbert Wiener, of M. I. T., refers to the present time as the beginning of the second industrial revolution. In the first, machines were substituted for men's muscles. In the second, machines will be substituted for men's minds. This is a dramatic way of putting it, but probably no exaggeration. The world of tomorrow may have as little place for the clerk as the world of today has for the galley slave.[2]

To this must be added the possibility of new and fantastically prodigious sources of energy. For many decades the depleting supplies of coal and oil have been pointed to by those who feared for the future. Vast new supplies have been discovered, but it is in alternate sources of energy that the promise lies. Atomic energy already powers a widely publicized submarine, with other projects being developed. Solar energy, while still in the laboratory stage, shows quite definite promise that it can be harnessed to do man's work. Virtually unlimited energy and machines that "think"—this is the basis of the new technological revolution.

What does this have to do with Christian education? Without entering controversy as to how far this technological revolution will ac-

1 In Lyman Bryson, ed., *Facing the Future's Risks* (New York, 1953), p. 80.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 83.

tually proceed, it will suffice to indicate that it has already begun, that new forms of human interaction will arise, and that educational objectives will have to include such new facts. Let us set forth several of these.

1. *New Center for the Organization of Life.* Ours is essentially a work-centered society. Life is organized mainly around the need to earn a living. This is the center from which life derives its rhythm. Suppose it is possible to reduce the work-week from the present basic 35 or 40 hours to 30 in the near future and 20 or 25 in the next generation, what will be the result? Actually, work for the purpose of earning a living will become a relatively insignificant activity of man.

This is not to state that work will not continue to form an important part of man's life. It will, however, not be work to earn a living but work as an expression of life. If the work-week is reduced to 20 hours for large masses of people, a new center will inevitably be established for the organization of life; a brief work-week will not be sufficient to do this.

In modern times we have allowed the meaning of work to be divorced from its connection with the Christian faith. Only recently have we been rediscovering the implications of the doctrine of vocation. Christian education now faces the expanded task of providing with Christian meaning whatever new centers arise for the organization of life. For most men gainful employment has been the organizing center of life; in the future it is likely to be other things more connected with what we now call leisure-time activities.

2. *Leisure and a Rising Standard of Living.* Closely related to the above is the question of leisure. So far the church has evolved no adequate doctrine of leisure because leisure was limited both in amount and in applicability to certain classes. While the importance of leisure to the development of civilization has been recognized from the time of Plato, leisure for the masses has largely been thought of in terms of temporary diversion. It has been pointed out that mass leisure has come upon us so suddenly that we usually interpret it in terms of the stereotypes of an earlier era.[3]

In some measure we are now in, and in fuller measure seem to be entering, a period in which large amounts of leisure are being extended

3 Reuel Denney and David Riesman, "Leisure in Urbanized America," in Paul K. Hatt and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., eds., *Reader in Urban Sociology* (Glencoe, 1951), p. 470.

to all elements of the population.[4] Moreover, because of increased longevity, the aged and women with grown children constitute a new leisure class. This can have immense significance for the social organization of life. Leisure can no longer be thought of simply in terms of diversion. Casserley's characterization of "modern mass leisure, with its tremendous and elaborately organized techniques, designed to save the masses from the boredom and emptiness of non-work . . ."[5] is a good one. In the extension of mass leisure there are explosive possibilities for man's social and spiritual life.

It must be remembered that it is not only the extension of leisure that is socially significant but also its extension in connection with a steadily rising standard of living. This means both that more people will have more time and that they will be able to do more things. It has been estimated that the median family wage in the year 2000, at 1950 prices, will be $6,600 a year—almost double the present income.[6] What is the relation of increasing wealth to Christian character?

It is imperative that the church develop an adequate doctrine of leisure and that Christian education interpret this meaningfully for various classes and groups of people.

3. *Education and the Technical Mind.* The combination of factors already mentioned will inevitably lead to a greater stress on education. Both greater knowledge and a higher degree of skill will be necessary to administer the society of the future. In a recent commencement address at Wagner College, the president of Queens College pointed out that in his boyhood graduation from grammar school was the norm of formal education; for the children of this generation it will be graduation from college.

If this were simply a matter of generally raising the educational level, the task of Christian education might be made easier. At least two factors complicate the situation. There will be a proportion of the population genetically not capable of receiving either increased education or skill. Moreover, the present splitting into specialties is likely to

4 Types of leisure according to class are reported in Lawrence G. Thomas, "Leisure Pursuits by Socio-Economic Strata," *The Journal of Educational Sociology,* XXIX (May, 1956), pp. 367-377.

5 J. V. Langmead Casserley, *The Bent World* (New York, 1955), p. 157.

6 William Fielding Osborn, "Implications of the Rising Standard of Living in the United States," *The American Journal of Sociology,* LX (May, 1955), pp. 541-546.

increase so that the communication of Christian meaning will have to be done in terms of many categories.

There is little hope that the society of the future will become less complex; in fact, there is every indication that complexity will increase. It is probable that society will more and more be administered by "experts." This is, of course, a present trend which portends to increase appreciably. It poses the problem of how people can truly participate in political, economic, social, and ecclesiastical decisions. Will this lead to new social stratification? If so, what form will it take?

Our great advance, it is to be noted, is in the technical field. Our age will certainly not be noted for its vivifying philosophical or religious ideas. It is technics and organization that dominate our thinking and activity. Penetrating criticism of the technical mind has been made by Casserley as follows:

> It is certainly true that our preoccupation with technics, with means rather than with ends, is already producing, among Western intellectuals, a new kind of philosophy, a kind of philosophy that resolutely refuses to think in terms of any ultimate purposes and values at all. But it is also true that the same preoccupation, on less intellectually rarified levels, is producing a new kind of popular culture, and a new kind of common man, living on the mere surface of events, his working life consumed in the service of technics and his leisured life diverted and still kept on the surface of things by the products of technics, a life more and more deprived of the depth, meaning, and relevance that comes from conscious affirmation of ultimate purposes and ultimate values.[7]

If it is true, as we have been promised by reputable men in many fields, that we are on the verge of phenomenal technical inventions and discoveries, this mind-set of a technical age may solidify still further.[8] Even without discussing the idolatry so early involved in man's attitude toward technical accomplishments—from men as the measure of all things to man as the master of all things—it can easily be seen that such an age may prove to be shallow ground for the seed planted by Christian education. It may be a particularly important task of the

7 *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

8 There are in evidence various counter-currents to this technical mind-set. The "return to religion" is one. The occasional calls for more liberally educated engineers is another. The inarticulate questioning and anxiety of the mass of people is still another. The core of our culture, however, is still thought and action based on technics. Witness the attempt to set forth a cultural superiority to communism—largely in terms of gadgets.

latter to point out clearly the fallacies and inadequacies of such shallow thinking and living.

4. *Authoritarianism.* Christian education must take into account a perceptible drift on the social scene in the direction of authoritarianism. The sociologist David Riesman has described it most graphically in his book, *The Lonely Crowd,* and in his phrase, "other-directed people." We are living in an increasingly collectivized society. Certain economic and social changes of the past few generations have forced us to organize social life more thoroughly with a view to the welfare of larger groups of people. As examples we can cite the development of corporations and labor unions, of private and public pensions, of plans for health care and urban planning, etc.

To this trend toward collectivization must be added several other factors. Mass media of communication make it possible, when deliberate attempt is made, to manipulate public opinion in a highly efficient manner.[9] The organization of life in secondary groups and the increasing complexity of life gives an individual little sense of direct participation and forces him to rely on "experts." The insecurity caused by the threat of mass annihilation, and perhaps the ultimate rootlessness of modern man, militate against freedom and cause man to look for ultimate answers given with all the trappings of authority. In the constant conflict between freedom and order, increasing numbers of people seem to be choosing order.

Does this account for the apparent success today of some of the most authoritarian church groups, from the Roman Catholic to fundamentalist sects? Is there a tendency on the part of people to want simple answers given with definiteness and authority? If this is an aspect of our social psychology, it has implications for Christian education.

5. *The Impact of Other Cultures.* Mass communications and increasingly rapid transportation continue to bring us into closer contact with all parts of the world. Only a few years ago aeronautical engineers were worried about the effect of the sound barrier at about 700 m.p.h.; now it is the thermal barrier at about 3,000 m.p.h. It

9 The concept of "mass man," however, is of doubtful utility. There is undoubtedly a pressure to conformity but modern man is also exposed to a wide diversity of ideas and influences. The idea that in an era before the Industrial Revolution each person thought things through as a free individual is a figment of imagination. Smaller homogeneous social organizations are usually better examples of the "mass man" mentality than our society.

seems probable that another generation will be able to sit at home and watch a television program from any part of the world, or travel to any place on earth in a matter of hours.

What are the implications for Christian education of such a situation? Undoubtedly, the coming generation will be exposed to the impact of many elements of other cultures. The major religions of the world will be set forth in direct and challenging fashion. The Christian faith will have to be presented in truly universal fashion, comprehending the totality of man's experience. In addition, Christian education will have to learn to use effectively the materials and techniques of mass communications. Today's teaching methods will probably seem terribly dated in tomorrow's world.

Demographic Trends

Christian education is ultimately aimed at people. The question is therefore pertinent, Who, where, and in what numbers will these people exist? If we are going to interpret Christian truth intelligently to people, it must be in terms of their life experience. Hence such factors as age and sex differentiation, urban-rural distribution, mobility and trends of migration have significance.

A word of warning is in order. The prediction of population trends is by no means based on an exact science; in fact, extrapolation of present trends to the future is fraught with the possibility of error. Because of the drop in birth-rates in the 1930's, some population experts were predicting a stationary population for the U. S. A. about 1970 at a level which we have already reached. In spite of the need for caution, there are several things that can be said about the future as a result of studying present demographic data.

1. *Increase in Population.* There will be more people in our country ten and twenty years from now. This is true in absolute numbers even though the birth-rate continues to decline. It is simply a matter of more people being in existence to produce children and of a constantly increasing life expectancy and lowered death rate for all elements of the population.

There is no real evidence that the great upsurge of population in the 1940's represents a long range increase in the birth-rate or a trend toward the reestablishment of the large family. Without going into detail, it can be said that "the increase in births was less the result of

an increase in family size than the result of an increase in the number of families formed."[10]

From the same source we find the following summation of population trends that has value for planning in Christian education.

1. Events of the past decade have shown the possibility of attaining a family size sufficient to maintain the population, and even to support considerable growth with the general framework of voluntary parenthood. We need not anticipate declining populations in the foreseeable future, if peace is maintained.

2. Growth at the high rates of the past decade came heavily from nonrecurring sources, and it is not likely to be maintained. Probably we should expect a considerable recession of births in the near future when marriage age stops declining and the short birth classes of the depression years constitute larger proportions of the parental stocks. Either waning prosperity or a relaxing of world tensions might produce a large drop in births. On the other hand, a secondary although attenuated wave of births should appear in the 1960's as the huge birth classes of the past decade move into the parental ages.

3. Most important of all, we should recognize that the system of small planned families has introduced a new volatile element in our society. We may expect both sharp swings in the rate of population growth and abrupt changes in the age distribution as birth classes of varying size advance through life. Probably we should expect a more moderate average rate of increase, made up of rather sharp short-run oscillations.[11]

2. *Composition of the Population.* An analysis of the composition of the population is much too detailed and complicated to be included here. Several general statements will be made to give some indication of present trends.[12]

For the first time in our history females outnumber males in the population. This is due to the virtual cessation of immigration in which males far exceeded females, the decline of maternal mortality, and the longer life expectancy of women. The present sex comparison is 98.6 men to each 100 women. There are, however, significant regional and ethnic variations of this rate.

The age composition of the population has been steadily increas-

10 Frank W. Notestein, "Population Trends in the United States," in Lyman Bryson, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 164.

11 *Ibid.*, pp. 165, 166.

12 Except where noted otherwise, the following statistics are from the U. S. Bureau of the Census, *U. S. Census of Population: 1950*, Vol. 2, *Characteristics of the Population*, 1953, Part 1.

ing. The median age of the entire population in 1880 was 20.9, in 1920 it was 25.3, in 1950 it had reached 30.2. The following figures illustrate the trend toward aging.

Year	*Under 10*	*10-19*	*20-29*	*30-39*	*40-49*	*50-64*	*Over 65*
1950	19.5	14.4	15.7	15.1	12.8	14.3	8.2
1880	26.7	21.4	18.3	12.7	9.1	8.4	3.4

This trend toward increasing numbers of older people is one that will probably be with us for some time.[13]

It should be pointed out that such percentages are not evenly distributed over the country. There are regional and rural-urban differences which, although diminishing, are still important. In 1950, of young people under 20 years of age, the South had 38%, the North Central region had 33%, the West had 33%, and the Northeast had 30%. In the 30 to 65 age group, there were 30% in the South, 43% in the North Central region, 43% in the West, and 45% in the Northeast.[14] Similarly, in 1950 42% of the population in rural farm areas and 30% in urban areas were under 20 years of age. On the other hand, 46% of the population in urban areas and 36% in rural farm areas were in the 20 to 49 year age-group.[15]

One further factor may be of interest. It must be remembered that any sudden change in the birth-rate moves through the entire age pyramid of population. Thus the trough of the 1930's and the great swell of the 1940's will have its effect for decades to come. This creates a problem in planning educational facilities. The fewer children of the Depression era are just now entering parenthood, and a downturn in number of births is to be expected. After the current boom, another somewhat smaller boom is to be expected in the 1960's, when the children of the 1940's begin to raise families.

The following estimate[16] of the numbers of people in each age group in the population may be of some help in educational planning.

13 An issue devoted to the subject, "Aging and Retirement," Ernest W. Burgess, ed., of *The American Journal of Sociology,* Vol. LIV (Jan., 1954), is informative on various aspects of this problem.

14 Cf. Luke Ebersole, *American Society* (New York, 1955), p. 96.

15 *Ibid.*

16 From Fred D. Lindsey, "Your Market in the Next Ten Years," *Nation's Business,* Vol. XLIV (May, 1956), pp. 38, 39.

Pop. in 1955	Pop. in 1960	Pop. in 1965	Direction	Trend 1956-1960	1960-1965
Under 5 years					
18,800,000 -	19,500,000	20,400,000	Up	.7 million	.9 million
5-14 years					
31,800,000 -	36,300,000	39,400,000	Up	4.5 million	3.1 million
15-24 years					
22,300,000 -	24,700,000	30,700,000	Up	2.4 million	6.0 million
25-34 years					
23,800,000 -	22,700,000	22,200,000	Down	1.1 million	.5 million
35-54 years					
42,200,000 -	44,800,000	46,200,000	Up	2.6 million	1.4 million
55-64 years					
14,800,000 -	15,600,000	17,000,000	Up	.8 million	1.4 million
65 and over					
14,400,000 -	15,800,000	17,400,000	Up	1.4 million	1.6 million

There are many other differentials, such as education, race, religion, occupation, etc., that could be given consideration, but these would extend our discussion beyond reasonable limits. What has been written must serve largely as illustration of the fact that educational planning must take seriously the differentials that exist in the composition of the population.

3. *Geographical Distribution: Mobility and Migration.* In its educational venture the church must keep up not only with shifting age composition but also with a shifting population. We have the greatest voluntary mobility ever known to a civilized society. About 20% of the people of the country move each year; of these, 14% move within the same county, 3% within the same state, and 3% to another state.[17]

Regional migration is primarily from the South to the North and West, from the Northeast to the West, and from the Middle West to the Far West. Between 1940 and 1950 the rate of growth in the West was 40.9%, in the South 13.3% (a large natural increase more than compensated for loss by migration), in the North Central region 10.8%, and in the Northeast 9.7%. The center of population is moving

17 This is from a study by the Bureau of the Census for the year from April, 1947, to April, 1948, reported in Luke Ebersole, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

steadily westward, now being located in Illinois just over the border from Indiana. Currently the Northeast has about 26% of the population, the North Central region about 30%, the South 30%, and the West 13%.

Even more significant has been the rural-urban migration. Because of advances in agricultural production and the needs of industry, over the past century we have shifted from 85% of population in rural areas to 36% in the country (only 16% on farms) and 64% in urban places. The result of this has been urbanization, which means more than a concentration of people in cities; it also implies a mental outlook and a way of life.[18] The fundamental outlook of our culture is now an urban one affecting even the values of those who live on farms. It is expected that this migration will continue for some time (reaching an urban population of about 75% in 1970) with probable increased development of extended metropolitan areas as cities continue to spin off suburbs, exurbs, and rururbs.[19]

These developments are of significance to Christian education not so much because of where people live (although background will have an influence on how the message is to be framed) but primarily because of the attitudes that accompany these trends. Constant mobility makes it hard for people to put down deep roots, to develop traditions, to relate themselves deeply to local people or institutions. There is a sense of transience about all human relationships. Flexibility is valued more than loyalty. "Adjustment" becomes a key word of the vocabulary. It is not expected that tomorrow will be like today. A constantly increasing population (and rising standard of living) helps give us a psychology of expansion. An aging population, with almost 10% who are 65 years or over, may inhibit some of our dynamism. Urbanization has caused us to live in a highly organized man-made world of largely impersonal relationships with an emphasis on material values. Obviously all of this has many implications for Christian education.

18 For some of the socio-economic characteristics of urbanism in America, see Donald J. Bogue, "Urbanism in the United States, 1950," *The American Journal of Sociology,* LX (March, 1955), pp. 471-486.

19 A discussion of certain characteristics of suburbs will be found in Sylvia Fleis Fava, "Suburbanism as a Way of Life," *American Sociological Review,* XXI (Feb., 1956), pp. 34-37. 34-37.

Social Disorganization

The purpose of Christian education is not only to save individual souls for heaven but by the grace of God to save the whole person in his total situation. It is important, therefore, that persons be visualized not as abstract entities but in relationship to their social milieu. While it is manifestly impossible to discuss here the whole matter of social disorganization in relation to Christian education, it is perhaps necessary, largely by way of illustration of matters which will be weighing heavily upon people for a long time to come and concerning which they will need Christian guidance, to indicate a few facts about some of our perennial social problems. This is not meant to be an analysis of the reasons for social disorganization, or of social problems themselves, but is intended simply to point out a selected few areas in which Christian education must be made effective in the years that lie ahead.

1. *International Relations.* The problem of war overarches all human endeavor. While war has always been tragic, it has served as a way of meeting certain social or political problems (and creating others). It is quite generally recognized now, however, that due to the possibility of mass destruction involving both victor and vanquished, war no longer has social usefulness. Only a perverse irrationality in man can cause its outbreak.

We must come to some solution of the problem of armed international conflict. The problem is not so much one of social engineering as it is one of building a foundation of understanding, acceptance, and appreciation on which new institutions can be built. The uselessness of war as a social institution is a new factor in the world. How can Christian education contribute toward the creation of opinion in which constructive social engineering can take place?

2. *Divorce.* Divorce is posing a genuine threat to our civilization. The central importance of the family to a civilization is acknowledged by most sociologists, yet we find ourselves in an increasingly serious situation. As Casserley has pointed out,

> Too many discussions of the Christian view of divorce confine themselves to the abstract theological question of whether or not, and in what possible circumstances, divorce is permissible. This is an interesting speculative problem, but it is not the problem with which the church is now faced. The church is now confronted with the concrete fact of a divorcing society, not just a Christian society in which

divorce is legally permissible and occasionally happens, but a society in which the divorcing habit has become chronic, in which an increasing proportion of those to whom the church must speak and minister are, whether we like it or not, divorcees, or perhaps the emotionally impoverished and spiritually deprived children of divorcees.[20]

There is no point served in setting forth extensive figures concerning the divorce rate and number of broken homes. It will suffice to point out that the divorce rate is slightly less than four divorces for every ten marriages; that in addition, a large number of marriages are broken by desertion and separation; that children are involved in two out of every five divorces, with about 2,000,000 children of divorced parents now in society.

The rate of remarriage after divorce is high. Eventually 85% of divorced persons remarry. The result is that "about 13% of both men and women now married were previously used to some other than their previous consort. Multiple monogamy has therefore become a not inconsiderable practice among the people."[21]

Since the effects of divorce and broken homes are cumulative over the generations, Christian education faces a prodigious task. A generation ago, sociologists were questioning whether or not the family had outlived its social usefulness; this is no longer the case. The problem now before us is how the ties of marriage and family, both of which depend in an almost unprecedented way upon the quality of a personal relationship, can be strengthened? Christian education should be one of the vital factors in this.

3. *Race Relations.* This problem is mentioned both because of its fundamental importance and because the adjustment to a pattern of desegregation will be important for at least the next generation. Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out in his *An American Dilemma* that the race question in America is basically a moral rather than simply a social problem. The problem of the accommodation of the races to each other within our society, as well as internationally, will be with us for a long time. Especially as Negro migration continues from the South to urban areas of the North and West and eventually from cities to suburbs, it will be impossible for any group to run away from the

20 *Op. cit.*, pp. 236, 237.

21 John Sirjamaki, *The American Family in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, 1953), p. 188.

problem. Once again Christian education must be directed toward the formation of attitudes that will make a solution possible.

4. *Juvenile Delinquency.* Juvenile delinquency is the hatching place for major crime. While it will probably continue to be a serious problem, the reams of publicity that have been devoted to it have not proved that the younger generation is "bad." There are several reasons why the situation seems so much worse. First, there is an absolute increase in delinquency because of the population increase. Second, there may be some proportionate increase due to the general insecurity, the breakdown of moral standards, broken homes, etc. Third, there has been a great deal of violence connected with a small portion of delinquency. Fourth, under urban conditions normal youthful behavior can get youth into trouble. Fifth, delinquency has broken over the barriers of certain lower class communities (although it is still more widespread there) and has affected all parts of society.

It seems probable that young people will be exposed to increased temptations. How can Christian education give them standards, values, and moral strength to withstand them? Mere moral strictures will have little effect. A grasp of the real situation facing youth must be exhibited before Christian education will even have an audience.

In looking at the possible social organization of the not too distant future, two basic developments have been set forth, namely, the technological revolution and the trends and composition of the population. In addition, several social problems have been mentioned, chosen almost arbitrarily among the many that could rightfully claim our attention, to illustrate that Christian education must be directed toward people in the totality of their life situation, including social disorganization.

Among the effects of the technological revolution, it has been stated that Christian education will have to deal with such matters as increased leisure and a rising standard of living, informing with Christian meaning new centers for the organization of life, an increased need for more education and skill, the matter of mass communication, a possibility of a trend toward authoritarianism and a world-wide cultural impact. Some of the trends and composition of the population have also been described in order that we might be aware that Christian education can never simply deal with the population as a whole but must always think in terms of sub-populations, age differentials being perhaps most important.

The Responsibility of the Church in Higher Education

By Herbert Wolf

THE CHURCH has had an historical stake in higher education. To some this is sufficient justification for the church's continuing role in higher education. But the radically different view of knowledge and the role of the university today make the role of the church different from what it was in the days so often lamented by the latter-day saints of Thomism.

I. The Church's Stake in Higher Education

It has often been asserted that as Lutherans we have a particular stake in higher education because of our own heritage. The Reformation began in a university in the personal life of a faculty man. This is true, to some degree; yet it is essential to point out that Luther's experience was one at which many a contemporary university would look askance and with considerable horror. His dilemma, "to find a gracious God," was partially intellectual, but it was considerably more than that. It involved the totality of his personality with all its faculties. It was, in the proper sense of the word, a spiritual experience—one which involved not just a single aspect of his personality but his whole being under God. Were Luther living today he would be advised to visit the Counseling Center, from which he would be hastily referred to the Mental Health Clinic. An experience involving the total personality is not unusual on the contemporary campus, but it would be rash to suggest that this is what is desired by college administrators—especially if it be a spiritual experience. The cult of adjustment ("a bastard offspring, born of the union of the mechanical ideals of our culture with moralistic Protestantism, baptized at the altar of the lowest common denominator, and dedicated to the achievement of mediocrity," says Rollo May), coupled with the paralyzing fear of bad public relations, inhibits the factors which confront students (and faculty) with the

necessity of making major personal decisions. The church's stake in higher education may be something of this confrontation of individuals with the misery of thinking and the agony of experiencing the dilemmas out of which come spiritual growth and decision. As Lutherans, we cannot justify our "meddling" in higher education simply by talking about the Reformation's beginning in a university unless we can make the university the place where God confronts man and demands of him the difficult decision of faith.

One other aspect of our heritage in education is often alluded to as evidence of our stake in higher education: Lutheran concern for growth in the Christian faith by means of the educational method, particularly the Catechism. This again has some validity, but only if we comprehend the purpose of the Catechism. It is not intended to be a means whereby the unsuspecting adolescent is inveigled into swallowing many curious and apparently irrelevant facts about God and the Bible. Its purpose is to educate the whole child so that he can grow by the Spirit into the stature of full manhood as it is found in Christ. In justifiable reaction against the subjectivism and emotionalism of revivalism and pietism, we have stressed the relative permanence of intelligent understanding. But when this is constituted by sheerly intellectual processes or memorization alone, the church is mimicking the contemporary university which teaches many more curious and relevant facts about molecules and aborigines. If the heart of Christianity is the personal pronoun, as it appears repeatedly in both singular and plural forms in the Catechism, this is also the heart of Christian education—to make a mature man of faith. The church's stake in higher education involves the scholarly presentation of facts about God, the Bible, etc., but it is much more comprehensive than that.

Finally, we could quote abundantly from the charters of early American institutions and indicate how crucial the church's stake was in higher education in those many institutions which it established. Today the secularist observes these nominally Christian institutions (as well as those which have had the courage to erase the hypocritical vestiges of nominal Christianity from their charters) and questions whether this is adequate reason for the church's present involvement in higher education. The Christian college is—or can be—the primary stage of the church's role in higher education. But the day has passed when the church will establish colleges with the amazing profligacy of

a century ago. The church still has to justify its involvement in higher education apart from the church college.

Turning from the historical, we can point to another kind of rationale for the church's having a stake in higher education. It may be called "enlightened self-interest." Though this phrase ought not be used publicly, it was this which basically motivated the establishment of many an American, and Lutheran, college. The church needed clergy, the clergy needed training so that they could have their proper status within both church and society, and so the church established colleges and seminaries. This is still the primary concern of the church in higher education in some Christian groups. The same enlightened self-interest visualizes the church's task in higher education to be, in the words of the General Prayer, that "they (i.e., the institutions of the church) may send forth men and women to serve thee, in the ministry of the Word, the ministry of mercy, and all the walks of life." We know from bitter experience how frequently our effectiveness in private and public universities has been measured by how many people enter what is called "full-time Christian service" or how many of our alumni are on church councils, are Sunday School teachers, etc. This is obviously important, but it is hardly justification for the church's participation and investment in higher education—at least from the university's point of view. Coupled with this there is often the desire on the part of the church to obtain university-trained laity who are able to make an intelligent witness to the contemporary scene, to be able to speak the language of the world, to proclaim the Gospel in and through their vocations. In the present conflict of ideologies this is essential, and in contrast to some Fundamentalism, this is part of our task. But again, this is not the reason for the church's role in higher education.

Another possibility should be cautiously included since it comes under the category of self-interest, but it is hardly enlightened. We still hear faint echoes of the philosophy of the church's stake in higher education which suggested that our primary concern is to protect the innocent student from the atheistic teachings of scientists, sociologists, and other campus demons. Admittedly, our student groups are too frequently ghettos of isolation and insulation from the "secularism" of the campus, and the sum and substance of the preaching heard in some churches adjacent to the campus is an archaistic negative apologetics which says in effect, "They're all wrong; we're all right." If this were

the sole interest of the church in higher education, the university might well resent and oppose the presence of such dishonestly competitive forces.

Having considered some of the inadequate and less-adequate rationales for the involvement of the church in higher education, what can be said about it? Is there a philosophy which is capable of articulating the reason for the church's having a role in higher education that is potentially acceptable to both the church and higher education?

The answer must of necessity be theological-philosophical. *The role of the church in higher education can be adequately justified only in terms of the nature of truth itself.* The concern of the university is, or ought to be, with truth; the concern of the church in the university community may be described in the same fashion. It is here—the concern for truth—that the lines of both the university and the church converge. It is here also that the university and the church diverge. Their convergence as well as their divergence are illustrative of the Greek mind and the Hebrew mind. Both are interested in truth, but they vary considerably beyond that point. Truth, according to the Greek mind, out of which arises the philosophical orientation of the university, is something which is to be sought after by every resource known to man. Truth, according to the Hebrew mind, out of which Christianity has come, is that which has its origin in God. To the university the pursuit of truth is a function of the intellect. The most common analogy is that truth is something which is seen in an objective fashion as a camera "sees" that which it photographs. There is little interaction between that which is seen and the observer. The locale of truth is within the natural order, including man and history. To the church, on the other hand, truth has a given quality. It is responded to by the whole being in the obedience of faith. The analogy is that truth is heard; and having heard, man becomes responsible for that which he has heard. The locale of truth is in history and in persons, above all in the person Jesus Christ.

In these points the university and the church diverge, but their common concern is for truth. Each of these perspectives as to what truth is has an axiomatic quality about it in that neither the definition of truth nor the methodology by which it is known can be proved or disproved. Each is ultimately a legitimate perspective through which an understanding of life and the universe may be seen. The university

and the church, however, are not mutually exclusive. Within the university there are many who are committed to the church's understanding of truth as it is in Jesus Christ; and they are quite properly involved in the pursuit of scientific truths which are part of this world and man's experiences and which are seen in the Christian perspective. Within the church there are those who, at the same time that they bow in humility before the truth as it is in Christ, have the task of pursuing truths that will most adequately contain and explain the truth. We call this theology—the scientific discipline which seeks to discover the structure and laws of the particular processes and events of God's revelation of himself in Israel, in Christ, and through the church. Theology formulates these truths, which in turn help to explain the relation of the church to higher education as the latter seeks to bring to bear the impact of the truth in the total university community.

Here something should be said of higher education's relation, or reaction, to the church. Unfortunately, the latter word better expresses the more negatively inclined response of higher education to the church and theology. The Harvard Report is not atypical in its combination of misunderstanding, suspicion, and potential ill will with respect to the church. The church has, we must readily admit, been guilty of obscurantism. The history of heresies and inquisitions in medieval and Reformation days only whets the appetite of many a ravenous anti-Christian as he approaches the church's attitude in relatively recent years toward science (both natural and human sciences), the political and economic *status quo,* philosophy, etc. Too often the church has failed to maintain a distinction between truth and truths, between God and our theological formulations about God and man, with the result that the university has feared the dogmatism of the church, not because the university was afraid of truth but because it loved truth and hated truths which usurped the place of truth. Add to all this the university's suspicion of all that smacks of anti-intellectualism, i.e., what appears to be sheer sentimentality in religion, and you have the possibility of a good case on behalf of the university's antagonism toward religion and/or the church. And, from the university point of view, all this is complicated by the sectarianism of Christian and religious perspectives, although this in itself is not a particularly justifiable criticism on the part of those to whom diversity in methodology as well as theory is strength, not weakness.

II. The Responsibility of the Church in Church Colleges

What is the responsibility of the church in higher education? Actually, it is no different in higher education than it is in any other situation, though the means by which it acts may vary. The church is to be the community of the people of God in whom and through whom the creative and transforming power of the Spirit redeems the world and men for Christ our Lord. The present reality as well as the goal is community, the means are worship and study, the task is evangelism.

Where and how is this responsibility of the church in higher education fulfilled? We have indicated that the primary setting of the church's role in higher education is the Christian college. Without attempting to duplicate the numerous recent publications concerned with the uniqueness of the Christian college, a few things must be said.

The Christian college is a redemptive community, one which is centered about Jesus Christ. Sin is as apparent in this community as in any of the experiences of man, and the church does not perfectly fulfill its calling. It is, however, a redemptive community by intent, and its constant task is its common growth toward the fulfillment of its calling. In the redemptive community of the church college, faith is an integral part of the very atmosphere and activity of the campus. The whole of life is lived under the lordship of Christ. Every area of personal and campus life is affected by him—intellectual and academic affairs, social activities, athletics, etc. The school does not *have* a religious program; it *is* a religious program. It is a university in the true sense of the word, a corporation of scholars who are bound together by a common unity of concern and truth—the unity of God. It is a catholic community, involving the total lives of all within the bounds of the community, and at the same time catholic in the heritage which it shares with all men. No one is free from being involved in the redemptive character of this community; the only way to escape is to leave.

Faculty members are selected according to the most rigorous standards of academic excellence and at the same time because they are intelligently and articulately committed to Jesus Christ and his church. Within the faculty there is a fellowship of love made possible by continual communication across departmental lines as all seek together to understand the relevance of that commitment to the truth which integrates their various truths. The "terrible responsibility of

the teacher" is to be the means whereby ideas and facts and persons confront students with the necessity of making the personal decisions which make for intellectual and spiritual growth. The students are selected primarily for their academic qualifications, and not because of their desired vocations or backgrounds. Their primary calling is to be students. Within the student body are numerous democratic and redemptive fellowships of minds and hearts. The non-academic staff has a vital share in the community in that in and through their vocations as secretaries, caretakers, cooks, etc., the Gospel of Christ is exemplified. The administration consists of those who have a genuinely Christian concern for the individuals with whom they live in the college community and are able administrators under whom the total community may grow and mature.

It is in worship that the corporate nature of the church school is most vividly demonstrated and strengthened. Through the Word and sacraments the creative and transforming Spirit is at work, redeeming both individuals and the community. Worship is therefore integral to the life of the Christian campus, and its primary integrating factor. All in the community participate as worshipers and leaders: students, faculty, administration, and non-academic staff—and their families. Worship in other less structural fashions is at the heart of the life of the community: morning and evening prayers, group worship, retreats, private devotion. Adequate facilities are provided within the dormitories and on other parts of the campus, as well as retreat centers away from the campus, so that the community of the campus may be consciously a community under God.

The distinctive task of the Christian college is education. The uniqueness of the redemptive community of the church school is not that it has chapel, or courses in religion, or Christianized administrative procedures. Its calling is education; its opportunity is distinctively Christian education. At the heart of the curriculum is the Bible and theology. These subjects are taught according to the best academic standards, and yet in such a way that students are grasped by the living Word. This implies a Christian perspective in the total curriculum and means the development of a Christian epistemology, which demonstrates the relevance of the Gospel to all of man's life and knowledge. This perspective is not an excuse for poor scholarship, nor does it permit obscurantism and dogmatism or using the classroom for

propagandizing purposes. All the qualitative and quantitative standards for academic excellence won by secular education are rigidly adhered to, yet at the same time there is an honestly admitted perspective of faith in God and his revelation in Christ.

The church college must also admit its limitations in faculties and facilities. Its primary task is in what is called general education and carefully selected areas of specialization and graduate work. Six excellent departments are far preferable to twelve mediocre ones. But in whatever areas instruction is given, the development of genuine Christian intellectuality is necessary.

As a redemptive community, the Christian college has an evangelistic task. It has a responsibility to the non-Christian and sub-Christian student in its midst. A Christian education produces mature Christians in the same way as a legal education produces lawyers. The claims of Christ and his Gospel over the totality of life are presented honestly and fairly in whatever circumstances are natural—within the classroom, in the dormitory, chapel, etc.—so that every student in the community is confronted with the necessity of making the decision of faith. The college also has a responsibility to the larger community in which it lives, to be a redemptive power of God. This involves consciously and unconsciously acting according to the most mature Christian ethics. The campus community and its individual members take part in the life of the community—its family life, its churches and schools, in social action and other projects. And the church college has a responsibility to the church and other aspects of education. It is a training camp for leadership for the church, and at the same time it is the intellectual arsenal for the work of the church. Faculty members have the opportunity to do research, to be creative thinkers and artists, to publish, to participate at their leisure in the life of the church and the community, without having the staggering burden of committee responsibilities and other official tasks heaped upon them. The community as a whole aids other areas of education, such as sending material and spiritual assistance to schools in other parts of the world, assuming the financial responsibility for outposts of Christian education on secular campuses, etc.

It is the responsibility of the church in higher education to make its church colleges redemptive communities of the people of God in whom and through whom the creative and transforming power of the

Spirit redeems the world and men for Christ our Lord. This means that in the community of the church college the church has the task of bearing the burden for building and maintaining facilities and staff on a relative par with other institutions of higher learning. To expect church college faculty and staff to live on pittances because of their devotion to the church is nothing less than sinful; to expect the community to develop in facilities which are antiquated and inadequate is unrealistic. But to maintain colleges for the sake of maintaining a name and a heritage is also sinful and unrealistic. Intersynodical cooperation in the honest analysis of strengths and weaknesses of individual institutions, in the determination of peculiar callings of certain institutions in particular areas of specialization as well as graduate study, and in coordinating the support of the church at large and the local development associations—this is essential. Unless the churches take seriously the uniqueness of their responsibility in the community of the church college, they ought to get out of the business. Sacrifices will be made; compromises will be necessary; perfection is not possible; yet the church college can be the community of the people of God in whom and through whom the creative and transforming power of the Spirit redeems the world and men for Christ our Lord.

III. The Responsibility of the Church in Non-Church Colleges

The second setting in which the church is responsible in higher education is the non-church schools, particularly the larger private and publicly-supported institutions. What was indicated with respect to church colleges is true in these institutions: it is the total ministry of the whole church which must be brought to the total community.

The ministry is that of the whole church. The responsibility does not lie with a division, a committee, an agency, a foundation, or a congregation, even though these are variously responsible instrumentalities for the ministry. Nor is it the responsibility of a particular geographical unit or synod. The whole church, i.e., the whole body of believers, in this case the Church of the Augsburg Confession, is responsible for the ministry of the church in higher education. The primary responsibility is one of prayerful concern. The failures of the church in higher education are essentially spiritual, namely, a lack of genuine

concern for the redemption of the individuals and communities which constitute institutions of higher learning, particularly those persons who are not included within the narrow confines of the church's primary vested interests of education, the church colleges. This is dealt with in various fashions, ranging all the way from statistical reports to public relations, but it is essentially a matter of the spirit. Concern may be stimulated by facts and education, but its motivation is a matter of the spirit, accomplished by the Gospel and prayer. The lack of concern is reflected in multitudinous ways, not the least of which is inadequate financial support. This, again, is the responsibility of the whole church, although the practicalities may vary according to the polity of the supporting synods. In spite of the twin dilemmas of centralization of authority and distribution of funds implicit in the compensatory fund approach of the American Lutheran Church, there is a real validity in making the financial support of the ministry to non-Lutheran campuses a matter of the whole church.

The total ministry of the whole church is brought to the total community. The university is not really a community in the proper sense of the word. It is a demi-community. The secular campus lacks community of persons whose lives are inextricably united with one another in a common perspective and purpose. The campus lacks community of truth: in its intellectual chaos there is no unity of truth or common pursuit of truth which gives integrity to the fragmented scene. The task of the church is to be the church—the community of the people of God in whom and through whom the creative and transforming power of the Spirit redeems the world and men for Christ our Lord. The church is a community and ministers to the total demi-community of the campus. It is not serving students only, much less exclusively undergraduates. Its concern is not the strictly academic groups within the campus: teaching faculty, research fellows, graduate and undergraduate students. The campus community consists of all these as well as administration and other non-academic staff. These cannot be excluded without the church's contributing to the fragmented nature of the campus rather than overcoming it.

It is at this juncture that a distinction appears between the church college and the non-church college. In the former, the church ministers through the redemptive community which is the church college; in the latter, the church ministers through the redemptive community apart

from and yet within the university. This is cause for continual tension in the relations between the church and the campus. In some of its functions the church is separate from the campus; in others it is a part of the campus; in still others their lines intersect. Christian worship, for example, is the task of the church, not the university, particularly the publicly-supported university. Teaching is a function of both the church and the university. When the church teaches informally and non-academically, it is apart from the university; and when the university teaches religion academically (even using the facilities and staff of the church), it is technically and legally apart from the church. Academic instruction, in other words, is the task of the university. The student organization is a function of both the church and the university. These distinctions create considerable tension; and unless both the church and the university clearly define their callings, ambiguity and conflict arise. The church is a voluntary redemptive community in that (unlike the church campus) the individual on the campus is not necessarily involved in its life, and if he chooses he can remain out of all contact with the redemptive community. The church is not the university, and the university is not the church.

Since the life of the church is its worship, and since this is not the function of the university, the church has a ministry which includes the larger community of townspeople. The demi-community of the university is a part of the larger sociological community, and not infrequently an uncomfortable part. Tension between "town and gown" is all too apparent in the majority of such "communities" in spite of the many areas of overlapping, such as married students, faculty, staff, etc. The church as the redemptive community should minister to this community as well. Thus the total ministry of the whole church is brought to the total community. This is a difficult task; but the creation of community is never simple. It is easier, and possibly more efficient, to minister just to students. It is better "polity" to concern oneself with the academic community alone, and then primarily in an academic fashion. But the Gospel of redemption breaks down barriers and creates community not only among students, among faculty, and among academic personnel, but between all these and townspeople as well. It is for this reason that the church's responsibility in higher education is theologically and, in the long run, sociologically and intellectually most

adequately fulfilled *when it is performed through a congregation which ministers to the total community.*

An additional comment is necessary regarding the responsibility of the church to be the redemptive community. The church, like the university, is a community of sinners; but, unlike the university, it is a community of sinners who have been called to be saints. As the Christian is always becoming a Christian, so the church is always becoming the church. This implies maturing in understanding and experience of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church. In the fragmented demi-community of the campus the church is fragmented and divided. The tension implicit in lack of community is reflected in the tension of denominationalism. Our one Lord is worshiped by one church, but it is also a divided church. He impels us in repentance and forgiveness to recognize and create community here also. A courageous conviction regarding the unity of the church, and action stimulated by that conviction, is part of the responsibility of the church in higher education. We do not, and can not, stand by ourselves. Cooperation with and within convictions is a theological and practical necessity. The significance of the holy, catholic, and apostolic church, alluded to previously, is inseparable also from our responsibility on the non-church campus.

The means whereby the creative and transforming Spirit works in and through the community of the people of God are the means of grace. The life of the church is its worship, and the life of the church's ministry to the non-church campus is worship. The Gospel may be proclaimed in other fashions, and people may respond to it in various ways, but unless they are related to the communion of saints in the service of the church, that grace and that response of faith will not remain and mature. If nothing else is shared in the life of the church, this is necessary. Classes, student organizations, socials, even evangelism, are secondary to this experience. Admittedly too much of the worship of the church is formalized, boring, and apparently devoid of the Spirit. Yet in the service are the means whereby the Spirit works. He works mightily through his ministers and through his means if we will but permit him. Worship is not unknown to the university. It worships regularly at shrines of its own design: just witness the awesome reverence when the flag is raised in the football stadium, the praise of alma mater on alumni day, the campus "hymns" sung in the local pub or fraternity. The church must allow the Spirit to transform its wor-

ship so that it can compete with and defeat the idolatrous worship of the campus.

This means that the liturgical heritage which is ours must be carefully and intelligently utilized. Through this means, wrought and hallowed by centuries of experience, the Word and sacraments are most adequately conveyed to the believer. In the use of this catholic heritage in liturgy, hymnody, music, and the other arts, coupled with a discriminating use of contemporary forms, worship is not only the instrumentality of the Spirit, but also the instrumentality of good education in that it involves a selective transmission of a cultural heritage for the purposes of creativity and growth. Instruction in the proper use and understanding of these forms is implicit in this.

The services of the church should be adapted, in the positive sense of the word, to the life of the academic community. This includes careful scheduling, multiple services, imaginative use of the liturgical heritage in kinds and times of services, regular and relevant prayer life, etc. A discriminatory use of lay participation in the services contributes to an understanding of the community of believers under Christ. Most important of all is the preaching of the Gospel. Good preaching is considerably more than expounding a text with biblical and theological accuracy. The university has a right to expect preaching to be biblically sound and theologically alert, intellectually stimulating and devoid of sentimentality and hypocrisy, and, above all, relevant. It is the church's task to supply men capable of such preaching, through whom the work of the Spirit may be accomplished.

Teaching is a means whereby the church fulfills its task in every situation, and in higher education this is doubly true. The church's understanding of truth must be made known in every legitimate way in the academic community. In contrast to the university's fragmentation of knowledge which produces specialists in many truths incapable of intelligent communication with one another because of the absence of common truth, the church proclaims truth which is given, which integrates the diverse truths of men. In contrast to the uncriticized presuppositions, the deadly axioms which condition the understanding of man and the universe, the church admits and articulates its perspective of faith. In contrast to the false neutrality of professors who do no professing, of irresponsible objectivity and detachment from life, the church demands that man be involved in the issues of life, that he

ought not die "without benefit of cause." In contrast to the university's absorption in facts and its refusal to face the basic issues of life, the church seeks to create the intellectual dilemmas which stimulate the questions Whence, Why, and Whither and proclaim its conviction regarding the meaning of existence. In contrast to the university's identification of education with intellectual and vocational skills, the church says that the spirit of man must grow, that his education is of the whole man.

The Christian understanding of truth has a legitimate place within the academic curriculum. The church must not cease requesting the university to introduce courses in religion within the curriculum. Religion, particularly historical Christianity, is a field of knowledge worthy of thorough scholarship and instruction on a par with any other subject. It claims the right to come in by the front door, as it were, and stand on its own merits, to preserve its own integrity in methodology and subject matter, and not have to come in only by the servants' quarters as part of the other fields of knowledge. Implicit in this is the principle that religion must be taught from the inside, from within the perspective of the subject matter. Such instruction must be intellectually and academically sound with respect to the qualifications of those who teach, the content and requirements of the course, as well as the approach and grading. Such courses are not for purposes of conversion, nor may other than academic qualifications be required for registration. The church cooperates wholeheartedly with the legitimate academic demands of the university, and in return, by a genuinely intellectual approach, Christian theology and epistemology, the Bible and church history take their rightful place in the academic scene.

Besides this, the church has a teaching function on its own. Noncredit courses, fulfilling in every respect the academic and intellectual requirements of credit courses, ought to be offered in a much broader scope than credit courses could legitimately offer. Specialized study groups, oriented according to subject matter, interest, academic status, age, vocation, etc., are integral to the church's teaching ministry. Conferences and retreats supplement the regular teaching and study program. Whatever the means may be, the concern is to lead the members of the academic community from a pre-critical to a post-critical faith, from a faith accepted and unexamined to a faith examined and held firmly.

Closely allied with the ministry of worship and teaching is that of counseling. While in the church school Christian counseling is the responsibility of the whole community, in the non-church school it becomes a basic function of the church, particularly its professional personnel. In the privacy of the counseling interview, with its elements of confession and prayer, of listening and speaking, the Spirit meets people at the point of their deepest concerns and problems, and his creative and transforming work is accomplished.

The church on the non-church campus is the community of the people of God in whom and through whom the creative and transforming power of the Spirit redeems the world for Christ our Lord. "Through whom . . . the Spirit redeems" is the task of the church in higher education. The university is not called to save souls. That is the mission of the church. Anyone who is not in a personal relationship with Jesus Christ is of concern in evangelism: the unchurched, the de-churched, the nominal Christian. If the Spirit is accomplishing his work through worship and teaching, he will work in the lives of individuals so they will see their need and find grace and forgiveness in Christ. The needs will vary, as will the opportunity to fulfill them. For some need will be aroused by the contemplation of the mystery of life and death, in the search for meaning. For others it will come in the consciousness of sin and guilt. For still others the opportunity for the Spirit will appear in personal problems. The points of "vulnerability" for the Spirit are many: academic probation, sex, the draft, finances, family problems, vocation, conflict of ideas, ignorance, loneliness, etc. Christ redeems men in the midst of their needs and in their place supplies grace and forgiveness. Out of chaos and dilemma come decision and growth and commitment.

But the task of the church is not just to make Christians of non-Christians, but to redeem the world—the world of the university. What has been indicated as part of the teaching task of the church is also its redemptive task: to confront the university with its own conviction concerning the truth. This does not mean to make the university into the church, or even into a church college, but to redeem the university to its rightful calling under God. The church must be the conscience of the campus. It must be alert and articulate when people are dealt with as expendable things, when half-truths masquerade as truths and opinions are paraded as facts, when democracy is violated and aca-

demic freedom is restricted or stifled, when the university tries to be the church or a church tries to take the university captive, when intellectual pride blinds the eyes of men to truth. The church must be vocal in campus politics, in the latent and apparent strife between students and administration and faculty, in the extracurricular life of the campus. It must make its witness heard within the frameworks of the campus: the classroom and laboratory, the dormitory and union, the newspaper and library. In all of this it must humbly exhibit the gifts of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, etc.

This task of redemption is the task of the whole church in the total community. It is not just the responsibility of the professionally trained personnel of the church. It is the task of every Christian. One of the responsibilities of the church is to cease using Christians for the "janitorial" jobs in the Kingdom and train them to serve as intelligent and articulate instrumentalities of the Spirit. It is they who are the members of the community in a way in which the professionals are not ordinarily recognized and received. They go forth from the community of the people of God into the demi-community in which they have their calling as students, faculty, administration, and staff, and are used by the Spirit in the acts of redemption. The church comes to the community, becomes incarnate within it, identifying itself with its sins, its dilemmas, its confusion, and accomplishes its victorious task of redeeming the world and men for Christ, our—and its—Lord.

Christianity and the Truth

By Paul L. Holmer

I

SOMETIMES Christian academicians compare invidiously the conceptions of truth current among the learned with those implicit in religion, particularly in Christianity. Often the comparison can be drawn for good purpose, especially when done to rectify the unwarranted ultimacy and brashness which are so inimical to science and scholarship but which nonetheless keep intruding into the scene. Most often the comparisons are drawn by persons who are not themselves content with a limited aim of rectification but who, in one way or another, impute more than they say and sweep aside the entirety of the intellectual endeavor by drawing a distinction sharply but in the wrong place.

Exacting distinctions have an intrinsic merit to the intelligence which is not to be denied. But the art of using distinctions to advantage and applying them so that their extrinsic merit becomes apparent is rare and presupposes more than a modicum of insight. It is well and good to draw a distinction between scientific truth and religious truth —every teacher of religion and most sophisticated ministers do so as the occasion suggests—but it would be well to take a little care and not use this distinction to encourage attendance at next week's service or tomorrow's lecture; for most religious discourses and most discussions about religion, and certainly all lecturing about whatever you please, are also described by scientific and scholarly conceptions of truth—that is, if they make any sense at all—and not by the religious conceptions of truth. Thus there ought always to be as much exactness in the use of a distinction as there is in drawing the distinction itself. Obviously, a distinction which is not discretely drawn might very easily be sloppily applied. The quality of a man's reflection can be determined quite clearly by the skill with which he makes his distinctions and the nicety, in turn, with which he can stick to them in the subject matter he construes. Almost a moral quality is presupposed for the latter; for the

willingness to apply distinctions in distressing and recalcitrant instances reflects upon the quality of the thinker as much as it does upon the nature of the subject matter.

This is all the more reason for looking closely at the frequently drawn distinctions between scientific and religious truth. If the distinction is drawn closely, so that exclusion of one by the other is implied, or if not exclusion at least opposition, then the distinction impinges upon the very effort to draw the distinction itself. Such a distinction refers, as it were, to itself. For certainly the reflection and discourse in which anyone makes and states the distinction aims at an objective validity which would insure that the distinction apply to both the scientific and the religious conceptions. The distinction, in other words, distinguishes truthfully. If this is not so, then the distinction does not make much point. If it is true, then the distinction makes its decisiveness felt only if it accounts for the very discourse and reflection in which the distinction is made. And here is the difficulty with all of those devastatingly sharp distinctions which so shock the laity. There is much more involved than meets the casual ear. This is why it is so much better not to simulate wisdom; it is better to stick to the anecdotes and even the text or the lecture notes rather than take a risk on what might turn out to be amazingly cutting but also frightful nonsense. It must always be remembered that one must also account for oneself. In reflection this means that every distinction must also be compatible with the thought which thinks the distinction.

II

The distinction between scientific truth and religious truth is usually drawn by religious thinkers who are anxious to explain the disregard for faith in the intellectual communities. Frequently the scientist's and the scholar's concept of truth is labeled "positivistic" or utilitarian; sometimes the religious view is called personal or teleological. For the moment these labels are not important. The question is, Why are such distinctions drawn, and for whom?

There seem to be at least two groups for whom such distinctions are appropriate. In every university and college, and perhaps more widely as well, there are those who believe that the truth market has been pretty well cornered by the scientists and those scholars who are scientific. The view that there are tested and accredited means of ac-

quiring truth which need only more manpower and more dollars to give a substantial lift to the common good floats like a bright promise over many a campus and learned society. The impressive grants for research that come from many foundations to struggling professors are very heartening too, and one has to fight the temptation that steals over one not to feel just a little pious about the whole enterprise. What seems to be at stake in this kind of academic *mythos*—for such it surely is—is an old view that says that ignorance is the problem and that virtue, if not identical with, would nonetheless certainly thrive in, knowledge.

It is not very difficult to seduce the young on most campuses with the genuine romance implicit in the pursuit of truth. In this world of bluff and bluster there is not much incentive for more than plausible half-truths and working rules-of-thumb. So one ought not to be surprised that something of a *cultus* grows up in the universities and colleges. The present rewards are often rather feeble, and when the dull routinized labors of science and scholarship get a little too heavy, we Americans (in contrast to our European colleagues perhaps—they are at least assured a large measure of social respect just because they are professors) get a little anxious and rejoice in the anticipated *eschaton,* those future days when our truths will have some locus and will really make men free. Undoubtedly this vision and its assorted accompanying innuendoes is inimical to the Christian view of truth. Certainly many philosophers and scientists, themselves advocates of positions like the above, think and say that it is. Oddly, too, the distinction is constantly re-invoked to the point where it is taken for granted, and this because both scientists and religious people use the same distinction in polemics with each other.

But there is also another company in the audience for this disjunction. Their number is smaller—in some places they are either underground or extinct; but they are important in virtue of what they believe and not in virtue of numbers. They are those who believe that there is a wisdom concerning human affairs which is not knowledge (at least it is not truths which can be said to be propositional in the same form as are those of the sciences) but is nonetheless a realization after learning, after contemplation, after effort, which puts men and things and duties and pleasures into their proper relation. The ancient philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, and numerous others since, are fre-

quently looked at as exemplary here. Most of the history of philosophy, in fact, is a serious and, one must admit it, a rather inconclusive effort to get at the reality or "being," the fundamentals behind the appearances, which, once possessed, are supposed to make one wise. The belief here is that extension of knowledge by itself does not help directly, but rather that there is another kind of insight, an intuitive grasp of first principles, which means the penetration into the things. Much of the teaching of philosophy in American universities and colleges got that "aura" of respectability which still lingers from this supposed aim. The attacks by today's theologians upon the logical positivists and analytic philosophers is engendered by the belief that if you do away with metaphysics, as the moderns seem to be doing, then you are giving up real seriousness and indirectly fomenting rebelliousness against God. Furthermore, you seem to be turning all who are really concerned to the only other court of appeal, the scientists and their conception of truth. The apologetic tactics of the hour demand the restoration of those very provinces of philosophy from which the most virulent attacks upon the Christian faith have previouly come. The promise of metaphysics seems to be the promise of wisdom; and those who believe that religious truth is a kind of wisdom are in the somewhat ironic position of defending the metaphysicians if they do not succeed and attacking them if they do. For, as Karl Barth and numerous others have noted, almost any metaphysics proposed produces a wisdom incompatible with the Hebrew and the Christian faiths.

III

There is something naive about the attempt to draw the distinction between scientific and utilitarian truth on the one side and wisdom or religious truth on the other. For the disjunction usually asserted does not present a genuine choice. In other words, the disjunction is not a disjunction. Obviously, there are fools on every side of every discussion; and the extreme optimisms and rather boisterous proselyting at the expense of the truth, whether in church or university, ought to be criticized. The problem can not be dealt with summarily, however, for there are too many levels of meaning and too many subtleties always present. But it is safe to say that the "either/or" is not at this point at all.

The truth that scientists and scholars seek is itself subject to de-

scription. Truth is a quality of a sentence, not a quality of a thing or a person. None of us can live very long without some truths of this variety at our disposal. Such truth is communicable and a conditional social good—conditional because its value is determined in large part by the uses to which it is put. It is communicable because truth is not a quality of the person who thinks it, nor of the situation in which it was originally found. This is why "objectivity" is so meaningful in intellectual circles. This word denotes a characteristic of truth, namely, that nothing idiosyncratic or personal or "subjective" or psychological determines its quality. None of us can get along as intelligent and thinking persons without the belief that there is a truth about things which is independent of our inclination and wish. Certainly such an ideal is most noble, and it is a very doubtful religious apologetic which begins by attacking this conception. There is nothing intrinsically irreligious about the notion—it suggests only that the communicable truths and the inter-personal relations of minds are possible under ascertainable conditions. The disinterestedness and detachment, the quality of "objectivity" belonging to a state of mind and to the devices used to convey truths, the willingness to forego the temptation of anticipating the results because of tradition, preference, or ease—all of these are made explicit in the descriptive theories about scientific and scholarly truth. None of us, I repeat, has any reason to quarrel with this, for even our common everyday discourse, if it seeks to make truth claims, presupposes what such a conception makes explicit.

The same detachment which men have tried to acquire as a personal quality they have also endeavored to give to the things thought about. Not only must learners be objective, but the symbols and the language must be too. Everyone who reflects wants the truth, and not the Protestant or the Catholic or any other kind of slant. Surely, we have to be content with less than the truth very often, and we all know about areas in which subjective factors (e.g., the positions taken on other matters, and even strong feelings) do in fact determine a person's truth claim. Even if this is so, we still can not do without the notion of some objective truth; for the supposition that makes saying this worth while—little as it might seem—is that this truth about other truth claims is objectively true, i.e., whether anyone feels this way or not.

It is true that the truth about matters of fact, the truth of science

and scholarship, does not tell us how to behave. Such truth as we can discover and communicate to others—teachers to pupils, for example —does not dictate its own use. This is admittedly its limitation. There are many who want to say more than this about truth, many who wish to trespass these limits. Truths of the teachable sort, those which are objective, are recognizably neutral; they do not make or presuppose moral quality in the learners. One can be learned in ethical theory without himself being moral; one can be erudite in theology without being religiously faithful. We have not found that which the romantics of history have hoped the increase of knowledge would provide; there are no cognitive bridges between moral indecision and decision, between the "is" and the "ought," between true teaching about the kingdom of God and being a member thereof.

When the Christian apologists plead their cause, as so many are doing today, by asserting that objectivity is a fake, that everyone is actually subjective and has presuppositions anyway, so why not the Christian presupposition?—this is an apologetic which destroys itself if ever taken seriously. The cure for partial objectivity is more objectivity, more disinterestedness, more detachment; and the history of learning is a long testimony to the fact that nothing which can have an intellectual statement gains when so defined as to give non-intellectual factors precedence. The naked and dreadfully stark fact that true sentences will never add up to a good man and that a good man is never a sum, however long the addition, is not to be significantly understood until maximal objectivity has been practiced. When it is so practiced, the meaning of being a person becomes apparent. The truths of science and scholarship do not make men good or responsible, directly and immediately. What moral and religious efficacy such truths have also inheres in their neutrality. The fact that truths are utilized as they are means that the neutrality of truth can be bent to every purpose, good or bad. The potential in the most niggardly of truths is the greatest for good and for evil where the neutrality is the most obvious and where all of the subjective factors are of minimal significance.

The wisdom tradition in Western civilization puts high premium upon the quality of the person. It is quite clear, too, that Jesus died to save sinners, real persons, and not propositions, not even the true ones. It is a mistake, and a grievous one, that is committed in our univer-

sities and colleges when the pursuit of objective truths is given soteriological status. Most men can not praise learning without exaggerating its powers, and the consequent is a very peculiar one: for in place of the maximization of concern, responsibility, and passionate interest that is the sign of ethical and religious maturity, the learned man who makes learning definitive of personality transfers the disinterestedness and dispassionateness and lack of concern essential to the pursuit of truths to the pursuit of moral stature. This is an easily forgiven error of the day. The desire of the learned to make the quality of their subjective selves as learners sovereign over all human beings is as ridiculous as the wish of the concerned to make their passions definitive for the pursuit of objective truths. The competition is actually between two ways of constituting the human passions: one, the way discovered by learned men and essential to learning and the communication of learning; the other, the way discovered by the ethical and religious men of history and which is the only way of ever becoming good and holy. It is a mistake, therefore, to juxtapose scientific and scholarly truth against religious and moral truth as if these two were competing opposites. The man who says that science and research will take care of everything is a sophist. In intellectual categories, a sophist is a man who believes that he can deduce a way of life from facts. Sophists are legion and, besides, can be either religious or irreligious. Their number seems to have stayed proportionately large since the early days of Greek philosophy. The fact that so many scientists are also sophists does not negate the importance of objectivity. Perhaps most of us who teach in the universities hanker just a little too much for the importance and for the pay that ought to go with such a high calling as sophistry pretends to provide; for what could be more important for a teacher than commanding that which could define another man's life?

It must be remembered also that all the learning about Jesus, about God, about the church, and about anything else ostensibly Christian or religious is couched in sentences claiming to be true. These sentences have to be true objectively or they are not true at all. Admitting the penumbral range of sentences about which all have difficulties, is it not true that all such truths will never make anyone Christian, let alone good? When Christians speak of Jesus as the truth, of the Christian life as the true life, of the Bible as God's truth, they surely do not intend to say that becoming a Christian is a matter of

learning true sentences. When Christians have meant this, they have illustrated the fact that sophistry has even its pseudo-religious forms. For here, too, the failure is one of trying to deduce the Christian way of life from supposed Christian facts. Truth in the religious sense is not a quality of sentences at all. Religion and Christianity very clearly seek to make men true subjects. Religious truth is not connotative—it is denotative, indicating always that quality which men can aspire to. Our objective truths about such a quality are not that quality. There is no substitute for being the truth, no matter what the quantity of truths we might possess.

Instead of maligning the positivists, the scientists, and the learned, we Christians ought to speak very sensibly and exactingly about the matter at hand. Once it was under the cloak of esthetic appreciation that men tended to define everything including themselves; today it is under the cloak of science and objectivity. This is an indication of how devious men can be. Everywhere there is widespread refusal to take the responsibility of being human seriously. The learned have their deceits too, just as do the esthetes and the practical men and the busy men. The Christian conviction is that Christ is the truth, the wisdom, the logos, for everyman's life. Certainly the Christian can understand the objective truths which the pagans and unbelievers (and believers) can and do find to be the truth as another instance of unmerited grace. Knowledge, like the rain, falls to us under conditions for which our faith and our subjectivity is not a cause. We believe nonetheless that Christ is the leaven in the lump of humanity which can save us by redeeming our powers for the new life. To admit that truth about matters of fact is available to believers and unbelievers neither mitigates nor enhances the conviction that Jesus Christ is the truth for onself and everyone else too.

Some things stay relatively constant, fortunately, through the ages. The forms of thought do not seem to have changed with their content, and this is why the ideality that demands objectivity has always been appropriate. An identity in difference, in differing places and peoples and times, can be found by abstracting oneself from all that is traditional and personal. But this is to discover the condition for truths and truths only. Men who have achieved this kind of detachment and objectivity constitute the learned community. This community includes a very large company, some of the dead and some of

the living. This community is made up of those who, however fleetingly and sparsely, have so spoken and written that parochialisms and prejudices are not relevant to what they say. Their listeners are of the same kind. There is, however, another identity among all men, and this is the sameness of the problems of existing. It is to this latter identity within our situations and within our multiple immediate problems that the Gospel is addressed. The role of faith thus remains despite the growth of knowledge. While learning remains neutral in abstraction, it assumes the color of our moral lives when it is used. This is why the capacity to know must not be utterly despised, for it is a reflection of what it means to be human; yet at the same time it is not enough. Because the quality of our lives is our damnation and our salvation, it behooves us to excel in living, thus to be able to present ourselves as fitting living sacrifices. Christianity offers us the truth our lives ought to become. This is its claim upon us.

Collections of Luther Medals in America

By Otto L. Schreiber

MUSEUM collections of medallions and coins of Martin Luther and the Reformation have grown apace in America in recent years to a remarkable extent. The two world wars had much to do with this spread and growth. In the first place, like so many other coin collections, the owners of estates and of valuable objects of arts in Europe were compelled to sell their life-long accumulations in order to recoup to a certain extent their fortunes which had been lost or destroyed. In the second place, many of the museum collections in Germany which were the pride of some duke, municipality, or other private person were pilfered by our American soldiers when Germany surrendered and were either brought to America or scattered around in Europe among people who appreciated the value of such collections more than did the pilferers. Some of these latter items finally came to America in various ways. In addition to all of this, some collections came to America in legitimate ways. Recently a numismatist of New York City brought from Amsterdam, Holland, the private collection of his renowned father. (All of these but about six were purchased for the Philadelphia collection, described below.) Another numismatist of New York brought a large collection of coins from England, among which was quite a large collection of Luther medallions.

Since the era of the Reformation, some four and one-half centuries ago, the issuing of medallions and coins has been used to commemorate the work of Martin Luther and the various scenes in that movement begun by him. Most of the medallions have been issued by some interested party, such as a city of Germany where a scene had been enacted, or by an artist, or even by a numismatist for business purposes; whereas the coins, as is to be expected, have been issued at the behest of the rulers of the principality favoring the Reformation or by a resolution of the senate or governing body of a city or community. The latter have the value or form of a taler (crown), half-taler, ducat, groschen, or similar denominations.

In the production of these medallions and coins all kinds of metals have been used, such as gold, silver, bronze, copper, iron, brass, nickel, porcelain, pewter, zinc, lead, aluminum, and white metal, a sort of combination of different alloys in varying proportions. It is known that one medallion at least was made of alabaster. Recently (1952) a medal appeared which was made of "kupal"—a combination of copper and aluminum, a German product. None seems to exist in platinum.

The events in the life of Luther and of the Reformation most frequently commemorated are his birth, 1483; the posting of the 95 Theses in Wittenberg,

1517; the Diet at Worms, 1521; Luther's marriage, 1525; Luther's Catechism, 1529; the Protestation at the Diet of Speyer, 1529; the Augsburg Confession, 1530; the translation of the Bible, 1534; the Smalcald Articles, 1537; Luther's death, 1546; the Augsburg Religious Peace, 1555. In addition to these there are medallions commemorating the erection of various monuments of Luther bearing different dates. (In the Philadelphia Seminary collection there are at least twenty-one specimens described as miscellaneous, without dates or with dates of unusual events.) Medallions have also been issued to commemorate the introduction of the Reformation into other lands or into certain German Lutheran strongholds. This array of events certainly makes Luther the most bemedalled man in the world; for let us not forget that these events are commemorated by the issuing of medals at each recurring date.

As is reasonable to surmise, some of the medallions of Luther also contain the images or busts of some of the other Reformers. For instance, nearly all of those commemorating the Augsburg Confession (1530) contain the image of Melanchthon, who was the author of the Confession. A few medals contain the images of Calvin, Zwingli, and Bugenhagen. Some of the sovereigns who were instrumental in introducing the Reformation into their own realms also appear on some of the medallions, especially on coins.

Artistic beauty and vivid imagination characterize most of these numismatic creations. Even though the artists lived centuries apart, they faithfully depicted their scenes and thus did justice to themselves and to their creations.

In both languages, Latin and German, chronograms have been devised in order to indicate the date when the medallion or coin was issued or what event was to be commemorated thereby. By the use of Latin or German, whichever the case may be, the letters of the legend on the one side which have a numerical value in Latin (M, D, C, L, X, V, I) have been raised or capitalized, and when summed up these letters determine the date. Not only is this a novelty, but when looking at the other side with a different legend the value of the letters capitalized will be found to be exactly the same. Another cryptic device used is the anagram, by which a different word or phrase is obtained when the letters of a word or phrase are transposed. An example of such an anagram will be found in Nos. 627 and 628 of the catalogue of the Philadelphia Seminary Collection, listed in the publication *Martin Luther and the Reformation in Numismatic Art*. Here we read, VIR MVLTA STRVENS, a man who built much; but when the letters are cast around, it will read MARTINVS LVTHERVS.

Not too frequently a Luther medal is what is known as a "box-taler." It is called a "taler" because of its size, usually attributed to a *thaler* or dollar, and "box" because the two sides can be unscrewed or lifted apart, thus showing a hollow interior or box. The purpose of the hollow interior is to provide a repository for some object; in all cases in the Philadelphia collection these objects are

small hand-painted scenes in the life of Luther and the Reformation. They are so arranged that when folded together they fit snugly inside the box.

The writings or legends mostly found on these medallions are words attributed to Luther himself. Perhaps the most frequent legend used is the opening sentence of his famous hymn, EIN FESTE BURG IST UNSER GOTT. Another famous statement attributed to Luther and employed on some of the medallions is: HIER STEHE ICH, ICH KANN NICHT ANDERS, GOTT HELFE MIR, AMEN. This statement seems to be used most frequently in the 1883 series, the quadricentennial of his birth. DAS WORT SIE SOLLEN LASSEN STAHN is also used. A statement not used by Luther but frequently found on his medals is, GOTTES WORT UND LUTHERS LEHR VERGEHET NUN UND NIMMERMEHR.

When we come to the consideration of various well-known collections of medallions and coins in the United States it must be admitted that they are not so numerous as those in Europe. A canvass of all the Lutheran theological seminaries and of a few non-Lutheran institutions reveals that only four of the Lutheran schools have a really worth-while collection. These are, in the order of their importance, Philadelphia; Concordia, St. Louis; Gettysburg, Pa.; and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. The last-named is at this moment in the process of formation and at present numbers a trifle over 100 specimens, though this collection will be enlarged as soon as new specimens can be found and purchased.

The Philadelphia Seminary has in its cabinet at present 642 specimens with over 100 new ones as yet undelivered and waiting to be catalogued and placed in the cabinet. This collection is by far the largest in all America and is the gift of one individual—a graduate of the seminary's class of 1906. He is also the donor of the Saskatoon collection.

The next largest is that belonging to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, located at St. Louis, Mo., and containing over 600 items. Saskatoon Seminary will have the third largest in the Western hemisphere and the largest in Canada. The Gettysburg Seminary has a collection consisting of 71 specimens.

There are several medals in the Philadelphia collection which are most highly prized. Of the three in that collection that were issued during the life-time of Luther, there is a bronze medallion of 1525 containing, on the obverse side, jugated busts of Luther and Melanchthon facing right. On the reverse side there are seven lines of inscription within a wreath, ·OB·/·SERVATAM·/·REMPVBLICAM·/·CHRISTIANAM·/·ANNO·/·M·D·XXV·/·F·F· (37 mm.).

The year 1717 has produced a very fine and rare silver medallion of Saxony which may be described as follows: Obverse: Bust of Luther facing and holding open Bible. VERBVM DOMI/NI MANET IN/AETERNVM. In the field there is a chronogram—MartInVs LVthervs theoLogIae DoCtor. Reverse: The sun shining through clouds casting its rays through a mirror set in a landscape. The mirror is designated MARTINVS LVTHERVS DOCT. Joh. V. - 35. (He was a burning and a

shining light.) The rays then converge at II Cor. 4:6. (God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.) Thereupon the rays diverge to make the twenty letters of CHRISTVS DAT LVMEN ORTV. In the field there is another chronogram, AETERNVM VERBO CHRISTI DECVS. The exergue has the words SECVLARI EVANGELICO/ALTERO (53 mm.). The author of this beautiful work is unknown.

A third unique medallion in the Philadelphia collection is the "box-taler" already referred to and which has no date. It is therefore placed in the miscellaneous group. Its description is as follows: Cast and chased silver box-taler with ring of the seventeenth century. (C.I.K. author.) Obverse: Emperor Charles V, surrounded by nine Protestant nobles, receiving the Augsburg Confession. PER DEUM OPI PERACTUM. The division is made by a dove with spreading wings. In the exergue: CONFESSIO AUGUSTANA / 1530 D 25 IUNI CAROLO /RECEPTA. Reverse: King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, mounted upon a charger and facing left, with the city of Luetzen in the background. A demon, representing the Catholic League, is seen under the hoof of his horse. HIC DEVS PRO NOBIS QVIS CONTRA NOS. The exergue: Initials of the designer of the medallion. It is used as a "schraub-taler" or "box-taler." The hand-painted pictures inside are by Abraham Reinhart. Only four specimens are known to be in existence. (45 mm. 18.11 gr.)

The Philadelphia collection also contains three medallions that were issued in the Reformation era, that is during Luther's life-time.

In the Concordia Historical Institute which houses the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod's collection, Curator August R. Suelflow informs me, the "total collection has not been organized and tabulated as well as we would like to see it." Mr. Suelflow states that a portrait medallion of Luther described by Mr. Henry Grunthal, assistant to the chief curator of the American Numismatic Society of New York City, is their most valuable specimen. The medallion was described by Grunthal in *The Numismatist* of April, 1943, p. 266, as follows: "It is, therefore, curious that the medal illustrated above seems to have remained unpublished up to the present time, and even more curious that it should have been discovered in the United States. I acquired it for a New York dealer, who had purchased the piece with a large number of other medals which he had recently bought from the estate of an American collector. . . . The medal is cast and chased, is the work of a German artist who did not sign his work, and cannot at present be identified. It may be thus described: Obverse: MARTINUS LUTTERUS engraved around a likeness of Luther in the costume of a monk, wearing a cap and almost facing his face slightly to the right; both his hands showing, and in his left is clasped a Bible. Reverse: SALVATOR MUNDI CHRISTI MISERER engraved around a bust of Christ to left, draped in a robe, but bareheaded and without nimbus. Silver, gilt, 37 mm., a loop is attached. The weight is 23.5 gr. Probably

unique. Unfortunately we do not know certainly the name of the artist who designed the medal. The irregular spelling of the Reformer's name does not give any clue to the local peculiarities that might point out the place of origin. But fabric and style make it fairly certain that the medal was made in the workshop of Hans Reinhart the Elder, originated about 1546, and was made in commemoration of the death of Luther."

The most valuable medal in the Saskatoon collection is the one issued in the Reformation era, in 1533. It is a bronze portrait medal without date, of the Hieronymus Magdeburg School. It is described as follows: Obverse: Portrait of Luther in monk's cap facing left. OS ET SAPIECIA DABO VOBIS CVI NO POTERT COTDICERE ZC. Reverse: The Luther rose. IN SILENCIO ET SPE ERIT FORTITVDO VESTRA ESA. (30.42 mm.)

There is a fairly good number of private collections of Martin Luther in America, as is evidenced by the auction sales of coin dealers in New York City. The dealers have stated that in their auctions several specimens of Luther and the Reformation usually appear, and that there are several bids for these medals, thus showing that different individuals are bidding on them for their private collections.

In this connection it must be stated that Mr. Frederic S. Telleen, former treasurer of the National Lutheran Council, made a private collection to which the present writer has donated a few specimens. This collection has been presented to the United Lutheran Church, 231 Madison Avenue, New York City, and is at the present time inaccessible.

The American Numismatic Society of New York City has a collection consisting of 143 specimens, six of which are of the Reformation era, which makes this collection outstanding. But the most outstanding medal in this collection is the one of 1521, made of gold, with the head of Luther on one side and the head of Christ on the reverse. The medal is the only one that was struck and is the prize medal of any in existence. Again, Mr. Henry Grunthal has written an article in the *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes VI* on this medal, and we quote from it here with his permission:

"Gold medal, 1521, by Hans Glimm and Peter Floetner, made of two uniface medals joined together.

"Bust in low relief to left. Legend starting at the bottom clockwise HERESIbVS. SI. DIGNVS. ERIT. LVTHERVS. IN. VLLIS — ET. CHRISTVS. DIGNVS. CRIMINIS. HVIVS. ERIT + The date 15 Z 1 engraved into the left field.

"Rev. Bust of Christ right, draped, with small upstanding locks in the middle of the forehead; hair in long curls on the shoulders; beard fairly short and curly. Above the head the holy dove. In the left field there is the following inscription: ICH BIN / DAS LEM / LEIN DAS / DER WE/LT SVND / TREGT JO / HANES / AM (I am the lamb that taketh away the sin of the world, from John I); in the right field: I. CAPT / NIMANT / KVMPT / ZV DEM / VATER D / AN DVRCH / MICH 10 / AM XIIII (No man cometh unto the Father but by me, from John XIV, 6). Habich 721. 61 mm. 87.8 gr.

"Habich lists four specimens of the obverse which were probably cast in lead. These are or were in the collections at Berlin, Vienna, Gotha, and Weimar. They differ from each other in that the Berlin and Weimar specimens have the date in Arabic numerals and the artist's initials incuse, while the Vienna specimen has the date in Roman numerals without the artist's initials. The Gotha specimen resembles the Berlin specimen in all respects except that the date and initials are in relief. An additional copy came up for sale in the Belli collection sold by Sally Rosenberg in November, 1904. This example was cast in silver with a reverse showing a long inscription. The gold specimen on loan to The American Numismatic Society was formerly in the collection of the "Chorherrenstift" at Klosterneuburg, Austria.

"The portrait of Luther on this medal shows a striking similarity to the engraving done by Lucas Cranach in 1521 before Luther's departure for Worms.[1] The combination of this obverse with the Christ reverse was recorded for the first time in Juncker's *Das Guldene und Silberne Ehren-Gedaechtniss D. Martini Lutheri,* where a drawing of the medal is to be found.[2] In a note Junckers tells of the owner of the medal. "Die Copiam von dieser schönen silbernen Medaille hat Herr D. Rundisch, ein beruehmter und curieuser Medicus zu Altenburg in Meissen, aus seinem Museo mir gegönnet."[3] (The copy of this beautiful silver medal has been lent to me from the museum of Dr. Rundisch, a famous and inquisitive

1 Cf. Lippmann, *L. Cranach,* Plate 62.
2 Juncker, *Das Guldene und Silberne Ehren-Gedächtnis D. Martini Lutheri,* p. 59.
3 *Ibid.,* p. 60, note

physician at Altenburg in Meissen.) The combination of Luther's portrait with a bust of Christ and the legend on the obverse express very forcefully the view that Christ himself would be guilty of heresy if Luther's teachings were branded as such.

"The medal is dated 1521, and there is little doubt that it was cast in that year. It is more difficult to come to the definitive conclusion about the artist who engraved the obverse side. The Berlin, Gotha, and Weimar pieces show the monogram HG under the bust. Habich in his corpus of German Renaissance medals states that the name of this medallist is unknown. In his earlier work, *Die deutschen Medailleure des XVI. Jahrhunderts,* which was published in 1916, Habich mentions the possibility that the artist of this medal was either Hans Guldenmund or Hieronymus Gaertner. He goes on to say, however, that the character of the medal does not permit the definitive conclusion that it was created by a Nuremberg artist. Dr. Behrend Pick, the late curator of the Ducal Cabinet in Gotha, thought that the signature HG might stand for the author of the distich. He was also inclined to attribute this medal to Lucas Cranach himself.

"The reverse of this medal with the bust of Christ was engraved by Peter Floetner, who settled some time before 1523 in Nuremberg. This suggests that the medal most probably originated in Nuremberg. Max Bernhard in his *Reformatorenbildnisse auf Medaillen der Renaissance* suggested that the Nuremberg goldsmith Hans Glimm was the medallist who created this medal. Glimm was a friend of Dürer who in turn had a very close relationship with Lucas Cranach. It seems very probable, therefore, that the artist whose initials were HG may have

been Hans Glimm, who was very well known for his skill and ability in chasing large size silver plaques as well as for his talent as an engraver. Stylistic examination of the piece, however, does not yield any greater certainty regarding the creator of this Luther medal, which is unique in its treatment and conception. Only the discovery of some hitherto unknown documents will prove conclusively whether or not Glimm deserves the credit for having produced this fine example of German Renaissance medallic art."

The Dead Wood in Theological Diction

By Stan Carnarius

"IT IS, then, precisely this factor, namely man as the *imago Dei,* that can be so misleading. For what is one to make of this when endeavoring to clarify the otherness, the dimensional beyondness of God when conceived as *Deus absconditus?*"

Baffling, is it not? Without even considering the ideas, the vocabulary itself bristles with difficulties. Yet many men seem to feel that such writing is a mark of learning and authority.

Not only is this familiar style cumbersome, but it can curtail the effectiveness of the whole theological enterprise. How many seminary students listening to lectures in this style never do find out what the professor meant? How many people hearing a sermon feel only vaguely that it is important for them? How many readers become confused by otherwise valuable articles and lay them aside?

The fact is that the continued use of such language is an expensive luxury in an age when so many seek so strongly for understanding. If it is worth saying, it is worth saying clearly.

This quality of the near-miss in communication is the nightmare that plagues all efforts at establishing verbal contact. The educator, the playwright and novelist, the politician, the public relations man, the diplomat, the parish pastor, the theologian—they all rely on words to carry out their function in the community. All of them have felt at one time or another that in some mysterious way language has let them down. Perhaps the truth of the matter is that they have let language down—they have misused their most important professional tool.

Certainly theologians, like other technical men, need the packed, short-cut words that can set up quickly the boundaries of discussion with colleagues. But these "code" terms, often in Latin, Greek, or German, must not get in the way of communication with the general public.

In guarding against this hazard, the theologian does not have to restrict himself to the simplest forms of religious language. That would be too great a loss. It is the very complexity of his message which must be maintained, for this is the source of new insights into faith, and new challenges to complacency.

As he conveys his full meaning, the theologian must remain aware of the dangers of merely possessing a professional language—it is useful at the right time, but he cannot afford to rely on it exclusively. Certain words and phrases may sum up a great deal for him but sound flat and meaningless to anyone even a little removed from the circle of specialists.

A rapid survey of recent theological articles offers many examples of the

several important types of theological vocabulary. The first grouping contains terms that are standard, that cannot be changed without disrupting the whole structure. These are the terms which come from the ecumenical creeds or the various confessions—words which can lead to schism if misused. Examples are *real presence, justification by faith, original sin, merit, infused grace, eros, agape* and *caritas, law* and *gospel.*

The second type is more flexible as it contains words for current insights, for new ideas and emphases. In this group are found such terms as *encounter,* with its Barthian overtones, the *leap of faith* and the *abyss,* with their reference to Kierkegaard, *existential, paradox, cultus,* and *ethos.*

These words can be changed to shift the point of view. When *encounter* becomes *relationship,* it implies less of a difference between the divine and the human. The reference to Kierkegaard is removed when *leap* is changed to *decision.* Such changes reflect the slow alterations of theology. In one sense they are the tags and identification marks of the various schools of thought.

The third class is made up of a long list of comfortable old words—the cliches. These are a fondly maintained but tattered legacy from an earlier generation. Most of these have long since been dropped by the general American public. Such terms as *outreach, ongoing, crying need,* and *besetting sin* are to be found on this list. Not really important words, they just add a particular atmosphere to any piece in which they appear. They limit the appeal to those people who are already part of the group from which such writings emerge.

Beyond these major types are the personal favorites and the little words used for hedging and meaningless qualification. Some of the latter reflect an unconscious effort to retain the flavor of a theological idiom other than English. *Precisely, this then, therefore, already, over against,* and *namely,* among others, are found in this category.

One of these "personal favorites" or "jargon" terms that is gaining currency at the present time is a small word but one used in important places—the verb *to relate.* One writer asked his readers repeatedly *to relate* the Christian value to something else—to the American scene, to Western culture. His purpose was to show what effect Christianity could have on these other areas of experience, but his verb made it seem to be merely a question of juxtaposition. According to him, if Christianity were put *next to* society, something must necessarily come of it. The heart of the argument was left static. The writer may have felt that he was describing the way Christianity can *influence, affect, penetrate, challenge, permeate,* or even *leaven* society. But he did not say so!

Another term that has cropped up several times recently is *centers*—whether as *centers of decision, centers of responsibility,* or just *centers.* Although it reads well, on closer examination the exact meaning of the word is hard to determine. Presumably, in one of these cases, the writer meant the particular situations or areas in which something has to be decided. But he did not say which areas. He

did not say whether these centers were psychological, sociological, political, or just the classic categories of human life: family, job, religion. Any acceptance of the writer's message was blocked at this point because his exact meaning had not been included in the words he used.

Jargon, whether personal or professional or an insight formalized in invariable phraseology, is open to the temptations of superficial use. It is possible to juggle such terms without really thinking about them unless they are kept flexible and "alive." College and seminary professors know the type of student who learns all the words and can rearrange them upon demand, but who never applies them to himself.

In summary, perhaps the distracting, deadening effect of these worn-out and misused terms can be seen most clearly when combined in a single statement: "This then is the crying need of the church in all generations—to relate the divine-human encounter to the centers of decision and the life situation of man and his society. It is precisely this failure which is the besetting sin of the church in our day, namely, that the Christian message is not made everywhere an ongoing concern, a positive outreach over against the distractions of the secular world."

This caricature would be funny if the style were not actually so prevalent. Assuming that theological truths can be put into standard English, a large question still remains. How can this awkward phrasing be avoided in the first place? From the writer's point of view, one part of the answer is having a genuine wish to communicate with the more general public. The other part is overcoming the specialized theological conditioning which impedes this communication. Anyone who has difficulty with this may find the following principles helpful.

In the process of writing it is necessary to challenge the first word that springs to mind. The first word may be the habitual rather than the accurate choice. Next, hesitate if it sounds like something that has been said before. Third, think what is actually meant and examine the words that have been used. The meaning should be clearly represented by the words, not left partially stranded in the mind of the writer. Last, organize the material with an eye more to clarity than to qualification. The occupational disease of the theologian seems to be a profound uneasiness in the presence of straightforward statement.

Applying these rules to the example produces the following results: "The work of the church is to make the individual's relationship to God in Christ important to him in every area of his life. The non-Christian distractions of our society make it necessary for Christians to act with new aggressiveness in reaching the unchurched."

Similarly, the passage at the beginning of this article would be easier to follow if it read: "The idea of man as the image of God can be very confusing in a discussion of the hidden God since it seems to contradict the fact of the difference between God and man."

Would it not be simpler to say it this way in the first place?

Early Lutheran Relations with the Eastern Orthodox

By Berthold F. Korte

LUTHER often referred to the Eastern Orthodox Churches. He felt that he had something in common with them. Both were considered by Rome to be schismatic, and condemnation from the same source gave the Evangelicals and the Eastern Orthodox a certain feeling of kinship. In 1521 the Reformer wrote in regard to Holy Communion: "Moreover, he [the Roman perverter] has against him the long continued practice of the whole church in all the world, the practice [the reception of both elements by the laity] that still continues among the Greeks, whom even Rome itself dare not call heretics or schismatics because of it. . . . I now say that on this point the Greeks and Bohemians are not heretics and schismatics but the most Christian people and the best followers of the Gospel on earth."[1]

Traces of Lutheran influence can be found in the Eastern Churches, though the channels through which these influences traveled are unknown. Benz[2] mentions that he found a translation of Arndt's *True Christianity* in a Russian convent. He furthermore recalls that some of the icons found in a monastery show a striking similarity to figures from Dürer's "Apocalypse." We are here interested, however, in an organized attempt to bring about an understanding between Wittenberg and the East. The father of this movement was Philip Melanchthon, who devoted his entire personality to this task. He was a kind and gentle humanist with an irenic tendency and a desire to preserve or restore the unity of the Christian church. He expressed his desire in the Augsburg Confession, where he tried to show the true catholicity of the Lutheran Church.

Behind this ecumenical endeavor was a strong eschatological expectation. The late Middle Ages were marked by eschatological tensions and expectations, and Luther could not remain unaffected by them. His entire theology was eschatologically oriented, a fact which has only recently been appreciated. Luther was convinced that the last day was at hand, but he did not force anybody to share his belief that Christ would come during his lifetime.[3] Eschatological expectations were nourished by the events of those days: the peasants' war, famine, dreadful diseases, and, above all, the fall of Constantinople to the Turks. From Con-

1 *Works of Martin Luther,* Philadelphia edition, III, p. 71.

2 Ernst Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz* (Marburg, 1949), p. 1. This article attempts to summarize the findings of Benz.

3 Lennart Pinomaa, *Der Zorn Gottes in der Theologie Luthers* (Helsinki, 1938), pp. 118 ff.

stantinople the Turks had moved westward. One battle after the other had been won, and at last they had arrived at the gates of Vienna. The Antichrist on the march![4]

Melanchthon saw the Turks overrunning all of Europe, destroying the Christian churches and bringing to an end Western culture and civilization. That, in the eyes of a cultured humanist, was the end of the world, just as the destruction of Jerusalem meant the "last day" in the eyes of the Jews. The Roman Catholic Church had refused to come to an understanding with the Reformation. It was now to be hoped that the Eastern Churches, being under the hammer, would be willing to establish bonds of unity with Western Christianity by way of Wittenberg.

The humanists of the Middle Ages were among the severest critics of the organized church and its institutions. They favored a reformation of the church and society, and many of them at first hailed Luther as their man. Most of the men with an ecumenical outlook were humanists, and the first attempt to strengthen the bonds between the East and Wittenberg came from Antonios Eparchos, a highly educated Greek humanist. Driven out of his country by the Turks, he at last found refuge in Venice, where he became acquainted with the writings of the Reformers. In a letter addressed to Melanchthon he pleaded the case of a united Christendom against the common foe, the Turks. His ecumenical interest was colored by personal and nationalistic tendencies, for the united forces of Christian Europe were to liberate all countries from the Turks and have them restored to their former rulers and owners. For political and egoistic reasons he complained about the weakness of Christianity and wanted it to be overcome. Christianity and the existing social order were identical to him. Antonios Eparchos showed not the least understanding for the religious principles underlying the Reformation. His ultimate concern was the kingdom of this world. He argued that the kingdom of God is far away. Earth is much closer. The religious issues are not important; more important are the Turks. All religious differences and prejudices should be settled, being overcome in the spirit of reasonableness. Unity of Christendom is the demand of the hour. Christians must not argue about doctrines while the enemy is steadily advancing! Christians must concentrate their attention upon the Turks, "that we may not lose the earth while searching for heaven!"

Melanchthon was deeply moved by Antonios' plea and referred the letter to his close friend and coworker, Camerarius of Leipzig. In a brilliant way this humanist defended and justified the historical right and need of the Reformation. With Luther's argument he defended the existence of the Lutheran Church. Rome does not have the truth on its side. The truth is found among the Evan-

4 Like Janus, the Antichrist was pictured as having two faces. The southeastern nations of Europe had no trouble in identifying him, the pope having destroyed the spiritual foundation of the church and the Turks smashing at the very gates of Christendom.

gelicals, who are persecuted by the pope just as the first Christians were persecuted by pagan Rome. Camerarius points out that it is not the fault of Protestantism if the Western world is weakened, but it is rather due to the egotism and ambition of princes who put their personal interest over that of the nation and go so far as to become allies of the Turks against Christian princes. No compromise is possible with those who deny the essential significance of God's revelation in Jesus Christ as given in the Gospel. He concludes this letter with these words: "Involved in this struggle is the truth, and not a human but the eternal and divine truth." Thus ended the first attempt to come to an understanding between the East and the West.

The second attempt came from Wittenberg and was marked by the compromising and irenic attitude of Melanchthon. His middleman was an Eastern Christian, a Serbian named Demetrios, through whom a correspondence was carried on between Wittenberg and the East. A few lines must be devoted to Demetrios in order to make clear his role in the effort to establish a relationship between Wittenberg and the East. Demetrios was born in Hungary (probably the modern Yugoslavia) and served two or three years under the patriarch of Constantinople, Joasaph. He was favorably inclined to the Reformation, and either on his own initiative or as a delegate of the patriarch of Constantinople he went to Wittenberg to gather first-hand information about the teachings and life of Protestanism. For about half a year he stayed in Wittenberg and was a guest of Melanchthon. He felt very much at home in the friendly atmosphere which surrounded this great scholar and he called Melanchthon "Father" and "dear teacher." Here he also formed a friendship with another Slavophile, Dr. Peucer, the son-in-law of Melanchthon, who not only loved the Slavs but was able to converse in their tongue.

To become better acquainted with the patriarch of Constantinople, Melanchthon wrote a letter which Demetrios was to deliver on his return. In this letter Melanchthon stressed the true catholicity of the Wittenberg Reformation and its genuine orthodoxy. To prove the truth of these claims a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession was to be given to the patriarch. Being a good diplomat and knowing the feeling of the Easterners toward the Roman Catholic Church, Melanchthon asserted that "all new inventions in the church come through the Latin monks."

Demetrios left Wittenberg, very probably with Melanchthon's letter and a copy of the translated Augsburg Confession, to return via his native Serbia to Constantinople. Previously Hans von Ungnad had approached Demetrios and had promised him a job as translator of the writings of the Reformers into the Slavic language. In his native Serbia Demetrios awaited the final decision on this project. Meanwhile Prince Heraclide had wrested Wallachia (in modern Romania) from the Turks and established there, probably with the consent of the Eastern Church,

a Christian kingdom which the prince wanted to reform after the pattern of the Reformation. To carry through this reform he called Demetrios, a former schoolmate of his, to give him a helping hand. These two men envisioned a reform of Wallachia and the Russian Church, but the rule of the prince lasted only two years.

The peasants of Wallachia, led by monks, started a rebellion against the prince, his rule, and his reforms. Forsaken, he faced the hostile and fanatic hordes who believed they would do a God-pleasing deed by killing him, and they hoped thereby to reconcile God, whose wrath was kindled against them for having forsaken Orthodox teaching. Demetrios shared the fate of his friend and ruler. Thus ended the life of the educated Serbian whose heart had been won by the teachings of the Reformation and who wanted his race to share its blessings. It so happened that Melanchthon's letter and the translation of the Augsburg Confession never reached Constantinople. This translation of the Augsburg Confession was, according to Melanchthon, to have furnished the theological basis for an understanding with the East.

We shall now try to answer two questions with which Ernst Benz deals: Who furnished the translation? Was it really a translation of the Augsburg Confession?

Dolscius, a former student of Melanchthon, wrote the preface to the Greek translation without having understood the real meaning of the document. What, according to Dolscius, was the purpose of this translation? It was, first of all, to promote interest in the study of the Greek language among theologians. Secondly, it is to show the great conformity of the teachings of the Reformation with those of the Eastern Orthodox. The real facts, however, bring out a very different story.

In all justice to the translator of the Augsburg Confession into Greek, we must see the great difficulties he encountered. These involved differences in language and piety. The Latin language was formed by the Roman mind, its laws, and its institutions, and these Roman conceptions were transferred to the religious realm. Man's sins were thought of as debts which must be paid. Man's justification was not so much a healing as a legal act by which Christ's righteousness is transferred by the infused grace of God. The Western church spoke of satisfaction and merit. The Lutheran conception of justification as a forensic act of God was hardly comprehensible to the East. Besides, Eastern piety circled around the three divine attributes, life, love, and light. Sin and forgiveness of sin were only secondary, contributory factors. Man is saved by the healing process of divine grace. Christ is the great physician whose healing power causes man to be saved. To meet this Eastern conception something had to be done: justification had to be sacrificed in favor of reconciliation. Accordingly the Greek rendering of the Augsburg Confession is not merely a translation but a revision in the interest of building a bridge between the East and the West. Terms of the Greek

liturgy were employed not only to make matters clear to the Greek mind but very often to remove theological obstacles which hindered union.

Who, then, was the translator of the Augsburg Confession? Melanchthon claimed that he knew about this translation and endorsed it. Who would have dared to translate this document which was held to be unchangeable? It is hard to conceive that anybody would have lent his pen to rewrite the Augsburg Confession except Melanchthon himself. He had done this before, in 1531, when he published the *Variata* which caused such controversy among Lutheran theologians. The Greek translation is based on the *Variata* rather than on the *Invariata*. Yet it is a complete revision and rewriting of the original. Benz comes to the conclusion that an examination of the text seems to confirm the assumption that Melanchthon himself prepared the translation. Crusius mentioned Melanchthon as the author. How did he know? He was a good friend of Camerarius, who was fully informed by Melanchthon about all steps taken in regard to the negotiations with the East.

The question still remains as to which Greek scholar or churchman assisted Melanchthon in the work of rewriting the Confession. The Greek language used in the translation indicates that the writer had a thorough knowledge of the Greek liturgy and phraseology. Benz draws the conclusion that somebody who was acquainted with the Eastern Church and its liturgical language assisted or at least advised the translator. The conclusion is that Demetrios was the man who helped to mold this translation and make it acceptable to the Greek mind. He was the middleman between Wittenberg and the East and had favored a rewriting rather than a verbal translation of the Confession.

The copy, given to Demetrios (1559), never reached the patriarch for reasons mentioned previously. Fifteen years later the so-called Tübingen Circle, including men who were adherents of the Formula of Concord, had some copies sent to the patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremias, and to some higher dignitaries of the Eastern Church. One of the most aggressive members of the group was Baron Hans Ungnad von Sonneck. He and others worked for the spread of the Gospel among the Eastern Orthodox. Feeling that they were called by God to carry out this mission, they translated writings of the Reformers and distributed them among the people of southeastern Europe. The language used in these translations was spoken and understood by people almost up to the gates of Constantinople.

Hans von Ungnad knew the people of southeastern Europe and had a firsthand knowledge of the Turks. Many a time he had faced them on the battlefield and had won a reputation as a fine soldier and leader in war. Again and again he was employed by different princes as their adviser in their dealings and in the crusades against the Turks. He knew the work of the Reformation, for he had been present at the reading of the Augsburg Confession on June 25, 1530. In all his correspondence he stressed his interest in spreading the message of the Ref-

ormation, but he was handicapped by certain political considerations. In 1540 he had been appointed captain general of Lower Austria, Croatia, and other countries.

Like most of his contemporaries, Hans von Ungnad was afraid of the Turks. Yet he was convinced that the message of the Reformation was the most effective way to meet the approaching danger from the East. The breaking down of the Smalcald League and the result of the Diet of Speyer in 1547 only increased his fear, but at the same time this fear stimulated his efforts to unite, strengthen, and revive the forces of Christendom. The Counter-Reformation of Emperor Ferdinand troubled him greatly, for in Lower Austria, which he administered, there were many followers of the Reformation. Finally, in honesty to his emperor and to his personal conviction, Hans von Ungnad resigned his job as servant of the crown.

Hans von Ungnad was now a free man to follow the dictates of his own conscience. He traveled much and made contact with many outstanding personalities. Finally he settled in Urach, in southern Germany, to carry out his mission. His field was the southeastern part of Europe. Faced with great difficulties in the enterprise of translating the works of the Reformers, he and his coworkers employed Greek-Orthodox priests to do the translating. One of Hans von Ungnad's closest coworkers was Trubar, claimed to be the founder of the Slovenic literature and language. At first the work of translating and distributing the writings of the Reformers concerned itself with the Slavic nations living within the framework of the Austrian empire; but after the translations were done in the Cyrillic language, other countries, such as Serbia, Bulgaria, and Wallachia, were to be included.

Melanchthon's eschatological expectation had a depressing effect upon him, but Hans von Ungnad and his coworkers were filled by that same expectation with a great zeal to do as much as possible before it would be too late. As their work progressed, their vision grew. With these Cyrillic translations even the gates of Russia were open to them. It was especially Demetrios whose plans reached out far enough to extend missionary efforts to the Muscovites. Mathias Flacius (Illyricus) took great interest in this far-eastern mission project.

The translations were to be read by the people and were thus unlike the Catechism of John Campanius, which no American Indian could read. Before the work of translating was undertaken, all preliminary tests were made to insure its usefulness and practicability. Problems like these were considered: Which people will understand these publications? Is this type of translation really the best way to catch the imagination of the people and attract them to Christ? Even the market of these publications was taken into consideration. Reports came in that in some countries they would have to be given away rather than be sold. By two gates the vendors of these publications were to invade the Eastern world. One was Transylvania, where the "Transylvanian Saxons," with Kronstadt and

Hermannsburg as their center, had lived since the twelfth century. Here the "Saxons," after having adopted the Reformation, had established a first-class school system. The second gate was Lithuania, for Prince Radziwith of Lithuania favored the work of the Reformation and the spread of the Gospel among his own people.

The true spirit of Christian missions becomes apparent when we remember that from the beginning Hans von Ungnad and Trubar had determined to take the Gospel of Christ into the Islamic world, to the very gates of Constantinople. Vienna and Venice, the most important trading centers looking eastward, were to be used as headquarters. Mohammedanism was considered not merely a political and national power but also a religious movement which could not be overcome by the force of arms. Mohammedanism had to be met on a religious level. The fathers of this missionary enterprise were convinced that the message of the Reformation was superior to the proclamation of the prophet and had the vitality to overcome the Antichrist himself.

This missionary venture grew out of the education of a few individuals, but they tried to put it on a national basis. All Protestant princes and free cities were called upon to support it. The undertaking was strictly religious, but Hans von Ungnad argued that it is less expensive to print literature than to send armies against the Turks. Hans von Ungnad carried on an extensive correspondence with Emperor Maximillian II (1564-76), who was favorably inclined toward Lutheranism. He addressed letters to the Protestant estates and the princes to arouse their interest and enlist and secure their financial support. And there was a response! We may say that the response was in proportion to the faith of the princes and leading men of their respective communities. Benz gives an interesting description of the replies and gifts of the different princes and municipalities. In spite of the poverty which prevailed in many districts, Lutherans understood and were willing to do something about the spread of the Gospel among the nations of southeastern Europe and among the Turks. Translations of the New Testament and writings of the Reformers were furnished and sold or distributed in tens of thousands of copies.

Correspondence and Comment

Rebuttal on the Lord's Supper

In a critique of my article on the Lord's Supper in the August, 1956, number of The Lutheran Quarterly Mr. James G. Berg quotes many modern authorities to show that I am wrong in some of my arguments and conclusions, particularly in my contention that the discourse of Jesus in John 6 does not refer to the institution. My purpose here is to clarify some of my arguments and especially to prove by conclusive evidence that the discourse of our Lord does not apply to the Lord's Supper. But first I shall attempt to correct a number of Mr. Berg's statements and references.

1. Going to other chapters in John's Gospel for explanation of Jesus' discourse does not seem to be good exegesis. First go by the facts of the immediate context.

2. The manna was daily food and is analogous to the daily eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood according to his words in the discourse.

3. Dr. Craig is quoted as saying, "No other evangelist goes so far in insisting upon the necessity of the saving sacraments of the church." That is, on the assumption that the discourse refers to the Lord's Supper, but this is a false assumption. There is not a word in the Gospel from which any of the appellations of the Eucharist is derived.

4. The author says that the new commandment is not really new. But Jesus said so. The love of one's neighbor is included in the Decalogue and is therefore old; the love of one's Christian brother is new as applying only to Christ's disciples, and the standard is not self but "As I have loved you." Cf. I John 3:16, "Love the brotherhood." I Peter 2:17.

5. Mr. Berg argues that my denying that Jesus gave his body and blood *to* the disciples involves, in his opinion, a false insistence upon temporal linearity. This insistence is based on the fact that Christ in his state of humiliation, when he instituted the sacrament, was limited by time and space, as can be proved by many passages.

6. When we speak of the church as Christ's body, we use the term in a mystical sense, and it should always be so understood.

7. The author states, "It is clear that John (6:52-58) had no doubt as to the identity of the elements with Christ's glorified body." But the apostle, or rather Christ, does not once in this passage mention natural bread or drink.

8. He also says that Paul felt the same way; that "these phrases (in I Cor. 10:16) could naturally mean only participation (with others) in the blood—and the body of Christ." According to the Lexicon to Wescott and Hort's edition of the New Testament (1949), made after the latest and best authorities, the first definition of *koinonia* is association. Christ wants us to associate the sacramental elements with his body and blood, and so does Paul.

9. In verse 17 Paul employs the verb *metechein*. This is not identical with *koinonia*. The former takes as its object something of a material nature; the latter something spiritual. It is obvious that only believers are here referred to, for they alone constitute the members of Christ's mystical body. We note the fact that the unity of the Christians is *here* based on the eating of the sacramental bread, not the eating of Christ's body. Cf. also *Didache*, 9.

10. The apostle does not speak of worthy and unworthy communicants. The members of the church of Corinth were all believers, either spiritual or carnal (I Cor. 3:1-4). Says H. E. Jacobs at 10:17, "We regard the apostles as assuming that all are believing communicants" (*Lutheran Commentary*). The severe judgment that came upon many of the members was not "much too severe." They were guilty of displaying an irreverent spirit, acting in an uncharitable manner, and despising the church of God (v. 22). To take the expression "discern the body" as referring to the body of Christ in the bread is straining the word to fit the preconceived idea of traditionalists. For a fuller discussion of some of these points, especially the teaching of Paul, the reader is referred to my articles in *The Lutheran Outlook* for October, 1951, and February, 1952.

As stated in my previous article, there are many differences between the discourse of Jesus in John 6 and the words of institution. I here adduce the dissimilarities I have found.

1. In the institution of the Supper a congregational culture and worship are contemplated; in Christ's discourse the individual is mainly in view.

2. In the former, Christ enjoins the use of material bread and wine and with this direction mentions his body and his blood; in the latter, he calls himself the bread of life, which can be received without earthly means. No mention is made of wine and ordinary bread.

3. The Lord's Supper is the antitype of the passover feast. In the discourse comparison is made between Christ as the bread from heaven and the daily manna in the wilderness (John 6:49-58).

4. In the one he speaks of his blood as about to be shed for the remission of sins and of the covenant established in his blood; in the other he speaks of his blood as true drink for the individual believer, and says nothing of the covenant.

5. In the institution Christ speaks of his body, the organism. In the discourse he speaks of his flesh, the substance. As before stated, the word "body" never occurs in the Bible as the object of the verb "to eat."

6. The one refers to his crucified body as a sacrifice for us; the other refers to his glorified flesh and blood.

7. The Lord's Supper reminds us of Christ for us; the discourse speaks of Christ in us.

8. In the one, emphasis is laid on Christ's death and, by implication, his resurrection also (cf. Matt. 26-29) as the foundation for our spiritual life; in the other, the emphasis is on his flesh and blood as nourishment of that life. Bread and flesh do not produce life; they nourish and thus sustain it (Zahn).

9. In the Lord's Supper Christ is made the object of our grateful remembrance; in the discourse he tells us to appropriate him by eating his flesh and drinking his blood. These are the leading thoughts in the Lord's Supper and the discourse, respectively.

10. In the former our redemption in the past on Calvary is in view; in the latter our present salvation and our future full redemption.

11. The Lord's Supper is ordinarily necessary for our Christian life, and we should partake of it at intervals, whereas the partaking of Christ's flesh and blood, according to the discourse, is necessary and must be continuous. Note his use of the word "verily" in v. 53.

12. All communicants, even hypocrites, can partake of the Supper; only believers can partake of Christ's flesh and blood acording to his own words, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him" (v. 56).

13. The eating and drinking in the Supper do not guarantee a blessed resurrection. In the discourse Christ guarantees a blessed resurrection to every one who eats his flesh and drinks his blood (vv. 54, 58).

14. Christ's words to his disciples at the Supper were understood by all of them; his discourse, on the other hand, gave occasion to misunderstanding, murmuring, and defection.

15. In the Supper we eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine as symbols of Christ's body and blood. According to the discourse we appropriate his flesh and blood by receiving his words (*remata*) in faith (v. 63), which is spiritual eating and drinking.

Here, then, are fifteen features in the discourse and fifteen in the institution differentiated and contrasted. The two passages are so unlike and dissimilar that it seems strange that the early Church Fathers did not notice them; and it is still more strange that in these modern times, when exegetical studies have so far advanced, a large part of Christendom still fails to observe them.

I conclude with a word by the noted biblical scholar, Bishop B. F. Westcott: "Any attempt to transfer the words (in John 6) to the sacrament is not only to involve the history in utter confusion, but to introduce insuperable difficulties into the interpretation of the discourses, which can only be removed by arbitrary qualifications at various points." Olof H. Nelson

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. By Joachim Jeremias. Translated from the second German edition by Arnold Ehrhardt. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. $3.75.

It is most gratifying that this important book is now presented to English-speaking readers in an excellent translation.

The first impression one gets from this study of the New Testament tradition about the Lord's Supper is a feeling of awe at the author's tremendous learning, especially his thorough knowledge of the Jewish background of the New Testament. You read the book with a feeling of safety that the author will not lead you astray from a path of solid observation. And the insight is strengthened that the New Testament is closely related to its Jewish origin and that knowledge of this origin helps to a clear exegetical understanding of the New Testament texts.

Furthermore, the book shows the fruitfulness of literary and form criticism when applied considerately. Jeremias thinks in these terms, but he uses the form-critical method in a cautious and, let us say, conservative way, which means that he does not try to prove more than it can really prove.

Let us report some of his results concerning the nature and meaning of Jesus' eucharistic words. After a painstaking examination of all the pros and cons, he states that the Lord's Supper definitely took place during the celebration of the Passover. John omitted the institution of the Eucharist in order not to give away this most holy rite to the knowledge of unbelievers. For the same reason the shorter text of Luke, which according to Jeremias, is not the original one, omitted the larger part of the words of institution. The author finds many instances of a practice of secrecy in the teaching of the New Testament, especially the way Jesus kept the secret of his messiahship up to the confession at Caesarea Philippi.

An examination of the different versions of the words of institution leads to the result that Mark has the oldest form, which through its many semitisms is recognized as the Palestinian tradition, the nearest to the Aramaic original. Matthew follows Mark closely, whereas Paul has a different Hellenized form, which is followed by Luke and seems to go back to the tradition of the congregation of Antioch. Both forms are uninfluenced by the style of the writers —I Cor. 11:23-25 is quite un-Pauline in style—but they represent the liturgical formulas that were used in the congregations long before the accounts were written. Thus they represent a tradition that goes back to the primitive kerygma and, since they agree essentially, they give us absolutely authentic information about the original event.

The meaning of the words is developed in two steps. Primarily they represent a twin parable. Jesus compares the bread with his body; as the bread is broken, so his body will be killed. The wine, red like blood (it was usual to drink red wine at the Passover), is compared with the blood. The twin term "flesh and blood" is often used to signify the sacrificial victim; thus by the use of these terms Christ points at his death as a sacrificial one. He compares himself with the sacrificial lamb.

But the words are more than a parable. In participating in this meal the disciples share in the atoning power of Christ's death. The meal, then, is not merely symbolical, but it is effective.

Perhaps the most striking contribution in Jeremias' book is his interpretation of "This do in remembrance of me." He understands these words to mean: this do in order that I may be remembered by God; at each eucharistic meal pray to God that he may remember the purpose of my sacrificial death and bring about the consummation of his kingdom. This understanding would strongly

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

underline the eschatological character of Holy Communion and would have its echo in I Cor. 11:26. This outlook, Jeremias thinks, is also stressed by the hymn of praise which concludes the meal.

Very interesting, but not so convincing, is the author's contention that Christ's words, "I shall not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my father's kingdom" (Mt. 26:29), have the meaning of a vow of abstinence; he is determined to abstain from food and drink until his work is accomplished. To the reviewer this seems a little far-fetched; the traditional understanding seems quite satisfactory.

We do not agree with everything in the book, but it certainly is demanding to argue with a man who proceeds so cautiously in his argument and who backs it with such stupendous learning.

PAUL LEO

The Church in the New Testament Period. By Adolf Schlatter. Translated by Paul P. Levertoff. New York: Macmillan, 1955. 335 pages.

At long last a work by one of the greatest exegetes of modern times has appeared in an English translation. This is an event of first importance. Consequently its review should be designed to disclose—in so far as that may be possible—some essential features of the mind of Schlatter. Professor Otto Piper, of Princeton, once made the remark that if American graduate students of theology who studied in Europe at the beginning of this century might have worked with Schlatter instead of with Harnack, the direction of American Christian thought would have been along more biblical channels. Sir Edward Hoskyns early perceived the importance of Schlatter. Karl Barth's writings reflect a conversance with his expository works. Rudolf Bultmann, however, seems to suggest that Schlatter speaks within a closed circle from which communication to modern man is quite impossible.

But who is Adolf Schlatter (1852-1938)? A Swiss by birth and education, he taught at the universities of Greifswald and Berlin until in 1922 he settled as a professor of theology at Tübingen, where he spent the rest of his long and industrious life. As a biblical theologian he worked almost alone through the period of the liberal domination of the theological world. When the experts explained the New Testament through a historical interpretation based on the Jewish apocalyptic and the Hellenistic environment, Schlatter insisted on expounding it as the Word of God. He did so with a consummate mastery of the very same linguistic and historical disciplines on which his opponents based their total work. Gerhard Kittel has pointed out Schlatter's unique fidelity to the Bible thus: "It is no accident that there has never been a Schlatter School even though few theologians have more decisively influenced so large a number of their fellowmen. None of us would have thought, or dared to think, of designating ourselves as Schlatterians. Never could anyone detect in him any other design than to manifest the reality of God in Christ."

Schlatter's scholarly work, which is almost encyclopedic, reflects a lively concern for the preaching of the Word in the church. The pastor's work was close to his heart. He wrote a lengthy work called "Elucidations of the New Testament" (three volumes) to help the ordinary reader understand the Bible. Besides works on the theology of the New Testament, he also wrote many commentaries on individual books of the New Testament.

What is Schlatter's point of view? What does this particular work reveal in regard to his presuppositions? The following excerpts will, at least in part, provide the answer to these questions. "Like everything that sustains life under God, what we call 'history' is at once an unfathomable mystery and something obvious and open to our observation. We are all aware that the life of every individual has its origin in that of others. This law dominates every movement of our life, . . . our willing, and our doing because they are based on the wills and deeds of others. . . . It follows that we shall not have read the New Testament properly if we have turned our eyes only to the individual apostles who speak to us from its pages. It is in showing us the formation of the church that the New Testament writings make history visible to us. These two

conceptions—'history' and 'church'—are intimately connected. Because Christianity engendered the church, it arose through history; and because it was history, it created the church." In view of this starting point, it is pertinent to inquire as to the significance of the historical method in understanding the New Testament. Schlatter refers to the reliability of the historical accounts of the whole New Testament, which is the "source of our knowledge of the apostolic community. . . . When these documents are used in historical reconstruction, their chronological order must always be taken into account. But chronological distinctions do not sever them from the undivided stream of events which gave the church its life."

Then we might go further and ask, What is the relationship between these ancient New Testament documents and their contemporary use? Fundamental for Schlatter's hermeneutics is this: "Nevertheless, it is not merely because the church of the New Testament speaks to us in its documents that we are able to gain a clear understanding of its history. It continues to exercise a powerful influence on our own history. Indeed, the connection between our own life and what took place in the New Testament is clearly perceptible; it possesses a decisive power over us. There is only one church; and this church, whose members we all are, came into being when the apostolic community came together. Our connection with her does not arise through our imitation of what then happened. . . . Her continuation in us consists rather in our own creative, spiritual thinking and acting derived from that history. In this way events that have taken place produce new events. . . . As we study the things that happened then, we appreciate both ourselves and the age we live in—and this the more unerringly the more we succeed in forgetting ourselves and our age, with all its needs and desires, in an un-self-centered and sober striving after a genuine perception of those events."

About the evangelists' portrait of Jesus, Schlatter believes that we find in the Gospels no attempt to explain the Resurrection, or why God delivered Jesus to death, or how he performed his miracles. "The disciple desires one thing of Christ, that he may show himself to him and so provide him with a basis and a rule for his own life" (pp. 40-41). The idea of regeneration is frequently understood against the Greek background of the early church. Schlatter explains it thus: "Peter, like the other Palestinian apostles, used the term 'regeneration' to express what Jesus gave to the world. . . . Above the vanity of human life, which the prophet likens to withering grass, waves the banner of good tidings concerning the Resurrection of Christ. This is the beginning of new life, a new beginning contrasted with man's natural birth—a being born again. Through it the vague longings of religiosity have been transcended; the hope which Peter received in the Easter experience was a living thing" (pp. 44, 45). Schlatter conceives the eschatological dimension of the early church as a most powerful motivating force in the present. "Just because the church was so concerned with what God would accomplish in the *future* she had a vital task to perform in the *present*" (p. 68).

In reference to authorship and dating Schlatter might be classified as a "conservative." James of the Jerusalem conference (Acts 15) is the writer of the epistle bearing his name. John the disciple wrote the book of Revelation, which appeared in the context of the tragic events of A.D. 68-69 (pp. 286-287). "Obsolete" we might say. Yet Schlatter argues with penetrating thoroughness and believes that the individuals introduced in the New Testament writings are men of action and that we should accept them with a simple realism instead of with a critical skepticism.

New Testament critics will ask: Does Schlatter drive his theological horse heedlessly over the fields cultivated with so much labor by historians? Is his synoptic view of the New Testament, as we have it in this book, a "pipe dream," something which existed in Schlatter's mind but never in the realm of history?

In the face of these questions, Schlatter has much support from the newest trends and discoveries in the new Testament field. His powerful sense of the unity of the New Testament and his ideas about the origins of the various books seem strangely modern.

This is true, of course, not in every detail, but in his basic affirmations.

J. W. HEIKKINEN

The Book of Acts in History. By Henry J. Cadbury. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 170 pages. $2.75.

Professor Cadbury's purpose in these Lowell lectures (1953) is not to discuss the history with which the book of Acts deals, but to place the book itself in its own historical setting and to show how it fits the culture of its time. This task is indispensable for the right theological and devotional use of the book, for it is not only to confirm the accuracy of Acts that one must consider its relation to the ancient world. "There is too much tendency to regard Christianity as something unique and apart in its origin. Yet it did not grow up *in vacuo*. It bore close likeness to the world which surrounded it. They were typical first century minds that gave form to its thought, as they were first century cities that gave it geographical setting. Even much of its religion was in accord not merely with Jewish but even with pagan outlook. If we are to distinguish in historic Christianity either the primitive or the original elements, we must recognize what is simply common in antiquity. Much that may seem to us distinctive is merely unmodern or unwestern (p. 7).

Readers of Dr. Cadbury's book on *The Making of Luke-Acts* (1927) and of the Commentary and Additional Notes which he and Professor Kirsopp Lake published in 1933 will be familiar with his approach and method, and those who have read his volume on *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (1937) will understand his aim in the present work, which is to explain the book of Acts in relation to the environment of its author and his first readers in order that the twentieth century reader may avoid both the peril of modernizing Acts and the peril of archaizing himself as he reads it. New questions and answers and new materials gathered since 1933 have been incorporated into these lectures. The first five chapters deal respectively with the five concentric but also overlapping cultural environments of Acts—General, Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christian; and Chapter VI traces the early history of the book *after* it was written.

In describing the cultural relationships of the book of Acts, these lectures bring together in brief and interesting form a large amount of information from many ancient sources: "naturalists, astrologers, horse-doctors, magicians, tacticians, rhetoricians, as well as authors of belles-lettres," together with the papyri, inscriptions, coins, and other archeological material. Always the author is concerned with historical accuracy and precision of statement, and he draws his conclusions cautiously, holding them open for revision in the light of more evidence that may be discovered in the future. When an interpretation does not necessarily follow from the available evidence, he confronts it with other possible solutions, and where a firm conclusion is not warranted he says so plainly. While he recognizes that the history which Acts relates cannot be separated from the book's own place in history, and that to a large extent the material with which he is dealing is capable of an apologetic use, his present purpose is to enable his readers to study the book in the light of all the cultural elements of the age in which it was written. In view of the tendency to oversimplify and of the temptation of specialists in one area of this complicated ancient cultural situation to overestimate what they are most familiar with at the expense of other factors in the making of Acts, this is an essential service. Besides furnishing an abundance of illustrative material, the reading and re-reading of these lectures will discipline theological conclusions by the facts of history which cannot be ignored without belying the claim of the apologist that Christianity is based on history rather than on myth. Chapter VI is a valuable contribution to the history of the New Testament canon —a subject which calls for more attention on the part of theologians than it is currently receiving.

RAYMOND T. STAMM

The Life and Ministry of Jesus. By Vincent Taylor. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955. 228 pages. $3.

Vincent Taylor is principal and professor of New Testament language and literature at Wesley College, Leeds. He is a well-

known author in the New Testament field. Some of his books are *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching,* and the *Gospel According to St. Mark. The Life and Ministry of Jesus* is an expansion of the article with the same title in Volume VII of *The Interpreter's Bible.* Much of the critical background for the work will be found in the author's *Gospel According to St. Mark.*

The book is a concise and very readable work on the life of Christ. After opening prolegomena, where he discusses the sources of our knowledge of Jesus, their historical value, and the relationship between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, Dr. Taylor moves quickly through the life of our Lord. The life of Christ is divided into five parts: the period before the Galilean ministry, the Galilean ministry, the withdrawal from Galilee, the Jerusalem ministry, and the Passion and Resurrection. Many of the chapters within these sections are just a few pages long.

Although there has been a lot of historical pessimism concerning the possibility of writing a life of Christ since Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus,* and still more since the rise of form criticism, Dr. Taylor firmly insists that writing a life of Christ is not only a worthwhile undertaking but is basic to our Christian faith. "Our faith rests upon scripture, and what Christ did and taught is a fundamental concern of doctrine. . . . Any just appreciation of Christ's person and of his place in theology and religious experience must be based on and checked by his teaching and the facts of his earthly life."

The author recognizes the rights of form criticism but rejects its extreme views. "Within their limitations the Gospels, while always subject to literary and historical criticism, are a reliable guide to the study of the mind and purpose of Jesus and to the turning points of his ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem." He feels that the emphasis on the Christ of faith has submerged the Jesus of history in a "sea of critical reaction" and that these two schools must be brought together and the insights of each must be made to contribute to the other.

The author works from the framework of Mark's gospel, although feeling free to shift the chronology at certain points. He gives support to Streeter's four-document hypothesis, yet he suggests there should be more emphasis on oral tradition and therefore that the theory with a future may be a three-document hypothesis which posits the use of Mark, Q, and M, supplemented by oral sources in the L tradition, the birth stories of Luke, and the narratives peculiar to Matthew.

In the section on the withdrawal from Galilee, the author points out that Jesus' withdrawal, first to the scene of the feeding of the multitude and then to the region of Tyre, was motivated by his very success, by his "unwelcome success." The multitudes throng about him because they have misunderstood him and look to him for political and world leadership. He was defeated by success. He could not put across his understanding of the Messiah to the people.

The author also feels that there is a development in the understanding of the Cross by Jesus as he draws near to it. It was during the withdrawal that the idea of messianic suffering became a dominating idea which determined all his future activity.

Another point we might mention is that Dr. Taylor maintains that one cannot adopt an either-or attitude concerning "consistent eschatology" and "realized eschatology." He says, "The teaching of Jesus is eschatological throughout, but this view does not prevent us from believing that he taught that the Kingdom was present in himself and his ministry, but was also future in the sense that it was to be consummated by God."

In spite of the author's readiness to allow a high degree of reliability to the Gospels, he does not go far enough in this direction. He rejects the historicity of the birth stories of Luke, he is reluctant to accept many of the miracle accounts for what they say, and doubts the historical basis of the Resurrection narrative. While we have come to the realization that the Gospels are not necessarily chronological in their arrangement, that they are proclamations and not biographies as such, and that oral tradition and different documentary sources are the basis of the Gospel records, the historicity of the Gospel records stands firm.

With these reservations we may say that it is a good book by an outstanding New Testament scholar and gives an interesting and concise study of the life of Christ.

L. Donald Docken

Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis De Zwaan Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. 245 pages.

Seventeen internationally-known New Testament scholars have contributed to this *Festschrift* honoring Professor De Zwaan on his seventieth anniversary. A minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, Professor De Zwaan taught at Groningen from 1914 to 1929, and since 1929 he has been professor of New Testament at Leyden and has served also as a member of the Senate. His writings have been voluminous.

Among the scholars who contributed special studies on Paul for this anniversary volume are C. K. Barrett (Durham), who wrote on the theme "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles"; M. Black (Edinburgh), "The Text of the Peshitta Tetraeuangelium"; P. I. Bratsiotis (Athens), "Paulus und die Einheit der Kirche"; Rudolf Bultmann (Marburg), "Ignatius und Paulus"; H. Clavier (Strasbourg), "La Sante de L'Apotre Paul"; F. W. Grosheide (Amsterdam), "Paul, the Apostolic Decree, and the Liberals in Corinth"; Joachim Jeremias (Göttingen), "Zur Gedankenführung in den Paulinischen Briefen"; and T. W. Manson (Manchester), "2 Cor. 2:14-17: Suggestions Towards an Exegesis." The list includes also Kenneth W. Clark (Durham, U. S. A.), N. A. Dahl (Oslo), C. H. Dodd (Cambridge), J. W. Doeve (Holwierde), A. S. Geyser (Pretoria), Bo Reicke (Uppsala), and the editors.

Barrett interprets apostleship in eschatological terms rather than in terms of ecclesiastical preeminence and administrative authority. The apostle is a link between the end of the old world and the beginning of the new. The "pillar" apostles had their special place as witnesses of the resurrection but they enjoyed no exclusive rights in the church. Bratsiotis, on the other hand, contends for an authority in the church that is both horizontal and vertical. Apostolicity, says he, is unthinkable apart from apostolic succession.

Kenneth W. Clark challenges the theory that textual criticism has no relation to doctrine and he introduces a number of select passages to indicate that the New Testament comprises a substantial body of critical issues which only textual criticism can resolve. C. H. Dodd contends that for Paul, who is deeply conscious of the governance of the Spirit, the law of Christ lies essentially in a solid, historical nucleus. Grosheide points out similarities between the letters of Paul and the old kerygma and concludes that they belong together, many scholars to the contrary notwithstanding.

Each of the contributors to this volume presents a fresh, scholarly study on some phase of Pauline or New Testament thought and sets forth conclusions with which others must reckon. For this reason the work is important for the New Testament scholarship.

E. E. Flack

The Formation of the New Testament. By H. F. D. Sparks. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 172 pages. $3.00.

The author of this book, a British scholar, has written something more than a standard, modern introductory work on the New Testament. He has set an example for future writers on the subject. He analyzes the New Testament not only in terms of its general historical background but also in relation to the life of the church. The New Testament is the "church's book" not only for the reason that it has "for centuries *possessed* it" but rather because the church "originally *produced* it." The individual writers "within the bosom" of the church wrote it to meet all the varied experiences which were an inevitable and a natural product of the infant church. But this is not all. The church, too, in the course of its experience found it necessary to establish the authoritative core for her literature, a process from which the canon was born.

The double fidelity of dealing with the problems of the historical-literary development and of the growing life of the church is well illustrated by the basic divisions:

(a) The primitive church and her Gospel, (b) St. Paul and his epistles, (c) The Gospels, (d) Acts, general epistles, and Revelation, and (e) The idea of a New Testament and the growth of the canon.

Writing very clearly and compactly, the author shows a deftness of touch in dealing with the innumerable and insoluble special problems relating to the authorship and origin of the various books. He thinks of Luke's work as showing a primary concern with the "progress of the Gospel and not with the biography of St. Paul. Biography was incidental. And so the end of Acts falls into place" (Rome). Granted Luke's aim, "there could be no better end, whether he was writing as early as 63 or as late as 85." He believes that the First Epistle of Peter may have been written by Aristion of Smyrna around 90-95, but that this is only the most ingenious guess possible. "For the truth is that, if we are not satisfied with St. Peter and St. Silas as joint authors, we can do nothing else but guess." Of considerable interest is his marked accent on the role of the Old Testament in the formation of the Gospel literature. "Christian preaching was . . . primarily directed toward establishing the Messiahship of Jesus. . . . The appeal to the Old Testament was thus fundamental to any convincing statement of the Christian case. . . . We have to think, then, of a common body of traditional 'Gospel' material circulating freely in the primitive church, consisting both of 'the things concerning Jesus' and of appropriate proof-texts from the Old Testament." His is a rather strong inclination to follow the "testimony literature" theory.

The final frame of reference, carried through consistently, is the church. "The New Testament has meaning . . . when understood against the background of the church which gave it birth and nourished it to maturity."

A welcome and a most useful book!

J. W. Heikkinen

St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient. By Henri Metzger. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1955. 75 pages. $2.75.

This little volume is the fourth in the series of Studies in Biblical Archaeology, the first three of which, together with the introductory volume, have already been reviewed in The Lutheran Quarterly. It is the only one among the first seven volumes which is not written by André Parrot.

The book grows out of the author's personal following of Paul's itinerary in the Greek Orient. The scope is limited to "a very brief commentary on the narrative of St. Paul's three missionary journeys in Asia Minor and in Greece, and of his journey as a prisoner from Jerusalem to Rome." The author's only aim is to "give a picture of the apostle's missionary horizon, to describe the countries which he traversed and the peoples to whom he preached his gospel, hoping that by this means the modern reader may be enabled to follow his trail through the Greek orient."

If one bears in mind the stated origin, scope, and purpose of this book, and does not expect a critical commentary on the book of Acts, or a volume on Pauline theology, one will find here a delightful and helpful guide to a better understanding of Paul's journeys. There are twelve photographs, four maps, a chronology of the missionary journeys, and a select bibliography of thirteen volumes.

Those who deal with British booksellers will be interested to know that the overseas price is 8/6, or $1.19.

James H. Burtness

Nineveh and the Old Testament. By André Parrot. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 95 pages. $2.75.

When we undertake the study of the Scriptures it is important to remember that our God has not revealed his purpose for men in a vacuum. Rather he has chosen the historical process. This involves the people of Israel as well as the nations of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt. André Parrot is the curator of the French National Museum and has done extensive archeological work in Syria and Mesopotamia. This delightful little volume is a study of the ancient city-state of Nineveh and its relationships with the people of Israel and Judah, particularly in the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. All the prominent rulers are

discussed in their proper sequence even though some of them did not live within the walls of Nineveh. The illustrations are excellent and may account in part for the unreasonable price of the publication. The author concludes his study with a relevant discussion of Nahum and Jonah. It may be that the author assumes in places too much familiarity with archeological work over the past one hundred years as well as the history of the ancient Near East.

JOHN V. HALVORSON

Bibel, Bekännelse, Ämbete. By Kjell Barnekow, Gustaf Adolf Darnell, and Ragnar Ekström. Stockholm, 1955. 138 pages.

The three subjects discussed in this book (Bible, Confessions, and Ministry) are in the forefront in contemporary theological debate. It is particularly the third, the ministry, which today is the object of much discussion in Sweden. It is obvious, for instance, that the discussion of the first two subjects is oriented toward the final chapter on the ministry.

The first chapter points out that the conception of the Bible has been disturbed by scientific and historical studies in the modern world. The author endeavors to present a view of the Bible which will safeguard the plenary inspiration of the Bible and at the same time leave room for legitimate historical criticism. He insists that inspiration is concerned with the actual text, but our salvation is connected with the events, not primarily with the text (p. 42). Salvation is not dependent on questions of historical details. He points out that even seventeenth century orthodoxy recognized variations in the biblical accounts which could not be harmonized and held that the Bible was not a revelation of matters pertaining to natural science. Scripture is a *means of grace.*

The second chapter emphasizes the value and validity of the Confessions. The acceptance of salvation by grace alone involves not only a general trust in the forgiving grace of God but also faith in the *content* of the Gospel as this is expressed in the Confessions. He stresses especially the doctrines of creation, the virgin birth, and the resurrection. Faith involves not only trust but also knowledge.

The third author expresses a moderate "high church" conception of the ministry, which is representative of a certain section in the Church of Sweden. He discusses at length the conception of the ministry in the New Testament. The doctrine of "the universal priesthood of believers," as that has been understood in reference to the ministry, has no support in the New Testament. In trying to substantiate this assertion he interprets "the saints" in I Cor. 6:2, 3, as a reference to "the elders" in the church (p. 106 f.), and "a royal priesthood" (I Pet. 2:9) as synonymous with "a chosen people" without any reference to the ministry. He tends to accept "apostolic succession" as one of the *notae ecclesiae* which should be treasured and possibly extended to all churches. But ordination is not a magic transfer of endowments from one generation to another; it is a new creation of the living God who thus calls and equips new laborers in his service. The author denies that his view of the church is hierarchical, but the impression nevertheless persists that he emphasizes the ministry over against the laity.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

Christ and the Caesars, Historical Sketches. By Ethelbert Stauffer. Translated by K. and R. Gregor Smith. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955. 293 pages. $4.50.

Interpreting Scripture is always more than a matter of semantics and syntax. Historical orientation is essential if a book, and the thought-world it represents, is to be set in a true and sympathetic perspective. This is especially important for understanding the apocalyptic portions of the New Testament, for although they were written to be understood by their recipients, their form is no longer congenial to our modern modes of thought and expression. The imagery and the historical allusions of apocalyptic strike us as fantastic and unreal and are susceptible to serious misinterpretation unless a backdrop of historical information exists to give them meaning.

Students of the New Testament and of the first three centuries of the church's history are profoundly indebted to Ethelbert Stauffer for this book of "historical sketches"

in which are dramatically exhibited many facets of the conflict between the Caesars and Christ for man's ultimate and undivided loyalty. But it is not the early centuries of our era alone which are illuminated. The relevance of this study to our own age is seen in every chapter, and one quickly senses the significance of the author's statement that "the book was written in an apocalyptic time in which the demonic nature, the violence, and the tragedy of the classical world, as well as the glory of Christ, pressed upon me with fresh power."

For thousands of years, beginning with the Pharaohs, the hope and expectation had developed in the ancient world that God would come savingly into human life and experience. This hope found expression in two forms: (1) the various myths of dying and rising heroes who in some way would overcome the curse of death which enthralled life and history, and (2) the concept of the divine kingship, the incarnation and advent of God in the emperor. This latter idea was most fully developed by the Roman emperors, in whose hands it became an official and powerful instrument of government. The demonic character of emperor worship became evident in the ruthlessness with which the empire reacted against the Christian movement in which it sensed—rightly—a threat to its claim upon man's total allegiance.

Like Shelley's *Ozymandias,* the monuments to this pretension to divinity strew the sands of time in the form of busts and coins which have long outlasted the claimants. It is from these, especially the coins and medallions, that Stauffer, himself a noted numismatist, draws an amazing array of illustrations to explain the struggle and illuminate passages in the New Testament.

Out of the sixteen chapters of this book only three are here selected for comment. In chapter VII, "Augustus and Jesus," Stauffer develops in dramatic fashion the contrast between the kings of this world and him whose kingdom is not of this world. In Augustus, who represents the pinnacle of political achievement, is seen the tragedy of history personified. He was the greatest of all Rome's emperors, yet his noblest achievements were marked by ambiguity, imperfection, and impermanence. In striking contrast, the humble Man from Galilee brought into the world the true kingdom, the divine kingdom in which the people of God live in creative and dynamic redemption and grace.

Chapter VIII, "The Story of the Tribute Money," is an antidote for unhistorical and superficial exegesis. It provides an essential orientation for us to whom money is merely a medium of exchange, not "tribute" and a symbol of political and religious allegiance. What on the surface appears to be an ordinary encounter is really a disclosure of the cosmic significance of Christ.

Chapter XI, "Domitian and John," is a most helpful introduction to the book of Revelation and again illustrates the need for historical orientation. Revelation remains an enigma whenever men interpret its allusions and imagery as primarily predictive or cryptic. In recent years interpreters have sought the source of Revelation's imagery in many places, (a) the splendor of oriental courts, (b) the symbolism of liturgy, or (c) the theaters and dramas of the Hellenistic world. Stauffer would add a fourth source, the advent celebrations, victory celebrations, and messianic games associated with the cult of the emperor. If one wonders why, of all the apocalypses produced in the first century, Revelation alone should have found its place in the canon of the New Testament, this chapter will both suggest a reason and develop an appreciation for the insight of the early church.

The fact that Stauffer succeeds in making "the characters of the drama—Augustus, Cleopatra, Domitian, John, the martyrs and confessors—come alive as brilliant and tragic figures" makes it a readable book. It is a book rich in erudition and information, not to mention inspiration. The seventeen illustrations, the chronological table, the index of persons and the references to biblical and patristic writers that appear in the text (none of which were in the first German edition, 1948) all add to the usefulness and attractiveness of the book. A word of appreciation is due the translators.

HARRY J. MUMM

Bible Commentary: The Minor Prophets. By Theodore Laetsch. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956. 566 pages.

This volume forms part of a new commentary of the Bible produced by scholars of the Missouri Synod. Their conception of the Bible is set forth in the foreword: "The message of the prophets is as significant for our day as it was to Israel of old. The Law of Sinai is as binding upon us as it was upon the Old Testament people under Moses, the judges, and the kings. . . . Jesus urges us to 'search the Scriptures.'" The book's purpose is "to create in Bible students an eager desire to increase their understanding of Scripture."

In that faith and to that end Professor Laetsch has undertaken this large volume on the Minor Prophets. He was a professor at Concordia from 1927 to 1947, and the book under review is a product of his retirement years and represents the culmination of many years of thought and fruitful teaching.

The preface deals with the earliest references to the Book of the Twelve Prophets, their sequence and chronological order in the Massoretic Text and in the Septuagint, and the inspiration of their work. The further contents fall into three sections, (a) historical background of literary prophecy, (b) the prophetic materials antedating the exile, and (c) those following it. The books placed in the pre-exilic period are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. Those ascribed to the post-exilic age are Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Most of the books are treated under three headings: (a) introductory remarks, (b) grammatical notes, and (c) commentary. A translation of the Hebrew text precedes each section of the commentary.

A good impression of the author's method may be gathered from his treatment of Amos 4:1-3. "The Lord compares the inhabitants of Samaria, particularly the women, to kine, cows of Bashan. Bashan was noted for the excellency of its cattle, luxuriating, growing fat and sleek on the rich pasture lands (cp. Deut. 32:14; Micah 7:14). The men of Samaria were habitual oppressors of the poor, the weak and lowly; the women, just as cruel, crushed the needy, destitute. Not a day passes but these petted, pampered society ladies cry to their lords for money. 'Lords' they call their husbands, yet these husbands are the slaves of their wives, must obey their every whim or suffer the consequences. Give! Give! Money! Cash! In order to satisfy their insatiable lust for luxuries, drinking parties, riotous banquets, the men must furnish the money. And the men obtain the money by cruel, heartless oppression of the lower classes. Madam Nabob sits in luxury, dines and wines, and whines for money; her lowly sister together with her family must work—work—work; their labor never flags! And what are their wages? A bed of straw, a crust of bread, and rags. . . . These poor unfortunates have no human friend to plead their cause. The Lord rises up as their Vindicator (v. 2). He swears by His holiness, His exalted majesty, His separation from all that is sinful, His hatred of all that is evil and all that are evil (Ps. 5:4; 5; 11:5). 'He will take you away.' They will be dragged off into captivity 'with hooks,' and their posterity, their remnant—every last one of them (cp. Amos 9:1)—with fishhooks." The final point is illustrated by calling attention to the Esarhaddon stela from Zendjirli, which depicts the Assyrian king holding the ropes attached to the mouths of his captives.

That quotation shows the incisive and vivacious language of the writer. Wherever he interprets the text in its context he follows the same general method. His grammatical notes are, on the whole, illuminating and constructive, though he does not show evidences of the latest lexicographical studies. His system of dates requires drastic revision since he follows Archbishop Usher (page 9). As a matter of fact, the whole commentary is in the best ultra-conservative tradition, though on some of the controversial matters such as Hosea's marriage, the Jonah story, and the question of a deutero-Zechariah, he gives attention to other points of view. Certainly Professor Laetsch is an informed, conservative Bible scholar whose work needs to be taken into account by students of the Old Testament, and he is to be heartily commended for his lucid commentary on the Minor Prophets. Though we

may not agree with the prognostication theory of the prophets, we can learn a great deal from his deep appreciation of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament—something which is so glaringly lacking in many sections of the Lutheran Church today.

J. M. MYERS

The Old Testament Since the Reformation. By Emil G. Kraeling. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 310 pages. $5.

Should the Old Testament have any authority in the Christian church, and if so, how is that authority to be defined? This question is of "commanding importance" and "runs through the whole of Christian history like a scarlet thread." The Old Testament problem "is not just one of many. It is the master problem of theology."

An answer to this question is not easily given, as is evident when one reflects that human slavery has been defended by quoting the Old Testament, and that even today racial inequality and segregation are defended by the same means. If the Old Testament is held to be canonical Scripture, as is the official position of Lutheranism generally, then the second part of the question, how that authority is to be defined, becomes acute.

Dr. Kraeling's book is not so much another discussion of this question as it is a history of the opinions important scholars have held concerning it. It is a history of doctrine concerning the authority and right use of the Old Testament for Christianity. It is not a history of Old Testament criticism or scholarship, such as have frequently appeared. "We seek something more fundamental: the thought concerning the authority and meaning of the Old Testament for the Christian" (p. 8). A great deal of information has been assembled and organized in this volume, and the labor involved must have covered a good many years. The reviewer does not believe that this task has been attempted before with anything of the scope of the present volume.

The names of 311 scholars who have contributed to this "Old Testament problem" are listed in a special index of names. The list and the book itself is limited to Protestant churches since Martin Luther. The majority of these scholars are discussed in the book, and the standpoint of a large number of them is delineated in some detail. An objective, descriptive style is maintained and, in general, fairness to the many different viewpoints is achieved. In each case an effort is made to understand the position of a given theologian in relation to his times and to his whole theology. The great range of opinion on the authority of the Old Testament, and the principles that should be used in approaching it, will be an eye-opener to many readers.

Although objectivity and fairness is evident in the book, it is also plain that the author's own standpoint is in the critical tradition (see, e.g., the Introduction).

It is not surprising, in view of the amount of material surveyed, that readers will demur at statements here and there. Thus a reader familiar with the whole of Kierkegaard's literary output will be surprised to read that "Kierkegaard experienced a crisis in July, 1843, in which his faith in a divine justice in life, as based on the Bible story of Abraham and Job, broke down completely; *from that time on he had had no use for the Old Testament*" (p. 248, italics mine). His authority is Emanuel Hirsch. Yet the interpretation of Kierkegaard is palpably false, for the latter's "Fear and Trembling" (Gen. 22) was published in October, 1843, the "Concept of Dread" (Gen. 3) in 1844, and Kierkegaard through pseudonyms refers approvingly to these works later on. There are several "Edifying Discourses" of 1843-1844, reprinted in 1855, which not only deal with Old Testament texts, but use them as the Word of God (e.g., Eccl. 12:1). Especially noteworthy is the discourse on Job (see the *Samlede Vaerker,* ed. Drachman, Heiberg, and Lange, Copenhagen, 1920-1936, III, 65 ff., IV, 9 ff., 139 ff., 305 ff., etc.). This bypath in Kraeling's work is, however, a rare exception, most of the interpretations being both accurate and penetrating.

Dr. Kraeling attended Lutheran Seminary at Philadelphia from 1909 to 1912, was associate professor of Old Testament in Union Seminary for many years, and has published a study of Job (*The Book of the Ways of God*) and *The New Elephantine Papyrus*

in the Brooklyn Museum. The present volume will long remain a standard work in its field, and the pastor who wishes to do some solid reading on the Old Testament problem will do well not to neglect it.

ETHAN MENGERS

The Cross in the Old Testament. By H. Wheeler Robinson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 192 pages. $3.00.

This book brings together under a single cover three monographs which had been published some years earlier. Each one of them is a discussion of the concept of suffering in the books of Job, Isaiah 40-66, and Jeremiah, respectively. Until his death a few years ago, the author was one of the most distinguished Old Testament scholars in Great Britain.

The first four chapters are an excellent introduction to the book of Job. He divides this book into its natural units and then turns to the thought and conviction of the ancient author that suffering is a means whereby God is glorified in every age.

The next three chapters are a discussion of the four servant-songs which we meet in Isaiah 40-66. The author relates the idea of corporate personality to the figure of the servant. Within the songs, the concept of the servant expands and contracts. At times the servant embraces the entire people of God who are languishing in exile. They are seeking to understand their present destiny. It becomes clear to them that suffering is the very organ by which the people of God accomplish their purpose in this world. The figure of the servant also contracts into a single individual by whose vicarious suffering the nations are restored to fellowship with Yahweh. At this point, the author's insight becomes rich and exciting. He contends that in the epistles of Paul this same concept is expanded so as to embrace the people of God in the New Age. Consequently suffering is the very organ and agency by which God accomplishes his purpose today through the new Israel, which is the Christian church. The author's discussion of these songs will remain a classic exposition for a long time.

This same teaching as found in the literature of Jeremiah is discussed in the last four chapters. In chapters 11 through 20 of Jeremiah, we meet his famous confessions. The author's treatment of the inwardness of this prophet's suffering as we meet it in the confessions and elsewhere is stimulating. However, there are a number of more recent articles and books on the literature and message of Jeremiah which surpass these concluding chapters.

This same author made a similar study of Hosea which has been made available by the same publishing house in a posthumous edition. It is unfortunate that it was not included in this volume.

JOHN V. HALVORSON

The Prophets, Pioneers to Christianity. By Walter G. Williams. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 223 pages. $3.50.

After a brief survey of the contributions of archeology to our knowledge of the background of the Bible and thus to our understanding of the Bible itself, and comments on problems connected with both the writing and the translating of the Bible, the author gives a careful evaluation of the role of the prophets in Old Testament times, and the official place in the organized religion which most of them held. He shows that, although they voiced opposition to some aspects of the priesthood, there was a large degree of cooperation between the two classes of religious leaders.

Through much of the discussion there seems to be very little recognition of the idea of revelation. The chapter title, "Man Discovers God," is characteristic of a dominant viewpoint. There is also a chapter, "God Speaks to Man"; but even this does not put clear stress on inspiration. Nevertheless, the frequent references to the "religious experiences" of the prophets, in which their thinking was shaped, point toward this important truth.

Various symbolic acts which the prophets performed are interpreted as mimetic magic, for the purpose of assuring and/or hastening the accomplishment of predictions, rather than as illustrations of the messages. This viewpoint seems much less probable than the idea of acted parables.

The chapter on Messianic expectations

emphasizes the great differences between the views in the Old Testament on this and those in the New Testament—in fact, exaggerates them. This is followed by a rather lengthy discussion of the future life, which traces various developments in the conceptions, with emphasis on the transition from the perpetuity of the nation to individual immortality.

Several prophets are individually discussed in separate chapters. The problem of Hosea's relation with Gomer is explored, and the theory is propounded that all his children were born out of wedlock, with Gomer being a harlot and nothing else—although he finally came to love her. This seems to destroy the force both of the picture of Israel's unfaithfulness to Yahweh and of the denunciations of prostitution. The treatment of Jeremiah lays excellent emphasis on the importance of his personal intimacy with God. Ezekiel is taken seriously on the traditional dating, beginning his work soon after 597—a welcome contrast to some of the modern radical views; his work also receives a higher positive appreciation than is sometimes the case.

The "relevance of the prophets for Christians today" is not as fully developed as the use of this phrase on the jacket would lead one to expect. It is shown, in general terms, as the permanent value of their religious insights and messages for mankind in general.

There are some clever remarks and helpful interpretations. But the book does not arouse as much enthusiasm as some other treatises of the prophets.

HAROLD L. CREAGER

The Twentieth Century Bible Commentary. Edited by G. Henton Davies, Alan Richardson, and Charles L. Wallis. Revised Edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 572 pages and 16 pages of full-color maps. $6.95.

Here is a single-volume commentary on the entire Bible, pleasingly up-to-date in scholarship, theological and evangelical in outlook, and serviceable for the typical Sunday School teacher and Bible student—yet sprightly enough that pastors may find it helpful for ready reference on their desks.

Although based on *The Teachers' Commentary* of 1932, the volume is a thorough revision, the work of 37 contributors from both Anglican and free church traditions, all in England except G. Ernest Wright, who treats archeology, and one of the three editors, Charles L. Wallis, professor of English at Keuka College, New York. The latter's hand explains, one supposes, why this American edition of the revised work avoids British terms for coins, weights, and measures, and even geographical allusions.

Not quite a third of the commentary is taken up with generally excellent introductory articles; the rest, in a two-column format, with notes on the biblical text. Six pages of illustrations depict biblical life and dress. The maps are the familiar ones from the Westminster Bible Atlas. Indices, a chronological table, and bibliographies are provided, though the bibliographical recommendations for Old and New Testaments stop with 1953, most work on the revision apparently having been done prior to that date. There are also suggestions on lesson series for various age groups, at least in the case of Acts (pp. 456 f.). Ten pages are allotted to introduce the reader to the apocrypha, concerning which the attitude of Luther is commended (p. 324).

Most of the contributors live up to the high standards their reputations suggest. At the outset Alan Richardson writes discerningly about "The Aim of Bible Reading." His emphasis on a God who acts in history and his insistence that we, like Luther, must "see the Bible as human witness to the acts of God for our salvation, acts wrought in the midst of human history" (p. 3) sets the tone for the succeeding pages. This theological, *heilsgeschichtlich* attitude toward Scripture characterizes the entire commentary, and the proper relation of the Old Testament to the New is therefore significantly brought out time and again. Even the article on geography does not lose this concern and become an end in itself; Palestine is presented as "the messianic arena" (p. 21). Crucial topics like "Inspiration" and "Miracles" are treated in a way that is biblical, but neither fundamentalistic nor modernistic in the extreme.

Essays and comment on the Old Testament are provided by such scholars as Hu-

bert Cunliffe-Jones; H. H. Rowley, whose concise "History of Israel" is most readable; T. H. Robinson; H. Wheeler Robinson, who is excellent on Hebrew psychology, the corporate personality, and the problem of suffering (pp. 94 ff.); Norman Snaith, and C. R. North, among others. New Testament articles are provided by C. E. Raven, whose "Beginnings of Christian Doctrine" appears before any other discussion of New Testament data, again showing the theological interest of this commentary; the rabbinics scholar, Paul Levertoff; J. A. Findlay, who parses succinctly the elements of the world to which Jesus came; E. G. Selwyn; C. H. Dodd, on Paul; and J. G. Davis, on early church life. Most of these men, it will be noted, have written larger works in their own right on the subject assigned to them; their conciseness here thus stems from views more fully documented elsewhere.

One weakness is that shared by any one-volume commentary: discussion of much of the biblical text must be omitted. I John, e.g., like many smaller books, comes off with introductory comments only. Of the Psalms, some 50 representative ones are analyzed. While Genesis is treated in 23 pages and Acts in 24, Romans receives merely 4. Such fragmentary treatment will not satisfy many students or teachers who turn to this commentary for help. The weakness of composite authorship also creeps in at times, and the left hand does not always know what the right one does—thus the varying views on such vexing problems as whether or not the Last Supper was a *Kiddush* ("yes," Selwyn, p. 363; maybe, G. E. P. Cox, p. 420); the authorship of the Fourth Gospel (cf. pp. 336 and 442); and the relevance of modern bedouin dress to ancient Hebrew costume (cf. pp. 28 and 42).

Differences in opinion, however, merely help underscore the fundamental honesty of the work. Critical problems are frankly acknowledged, and where there is no satisfactory answer, it is admitted.

Only occasionally are corrections necessary. The section on New Testament archeology, written in 1953, reflects perhaps too much premature stress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the statement (p. 45) that the Book of Lamech was recovered in the caves has turned out to be inaccurate.

Sometimes the specialized vocabulary will send average readers scurrying for dictionaries or, in the case of the very technical essay on the Hebrew language, on to later chapters. And finally, in spite of enthusiastic adherence to modern critical scholarship most of the time—which this reviewer is thankful to see filtering down into more popular works—old traditions occasionally linger on, perpetuated by a theological concern that often seems out of step with the critical approach. The comment, e.g., on Gen. 4, "the 'sign for Cain' under which we are all placed is the sign of the Cross" (p. 108), verges on the kind of excess that may sound appropriate in the Church Fathers, but which leads *Heilsgeschichte* into neo-allegorizing.

No reader, of course, will agree with everything in so ambitious an undertaking as a one-volume commentary on the whole Bible; but everyone must be grateful to the contributors, editors, and publisher for making available this helpful tool for teachers and readers seeking the Word in the words.

JOHN REUMANN

The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology. By George S. Hendry. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. 128 pages. $2.50.

The author states very clearly his purpose in writing: "The book does not pretend to offer a systematic doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Its purpose is merely to direct attention to certain doctrinal problems in this area which have emerged in recent theological thought." Dr. Hendry does more than just direct our attention to these problems; he fearlessly wades into them and in so doing compels his reader to do some real thinking. One should not be misled by the brevity suggested by the number of pages, for while the book is brief, it is so packed with thought-provoking statements and observations that the reader must go back to other source materials. This does not mean that Dr. Hendry has failed to cite the materials and to interpret them, but that one is led to give such serious thought to the problems that one will desire to go back for fur-

ther study. To this reviewer this is one of the strong points of the book. It must be pointed out that while the material is theologically heavy, the style of writing is very readable.

G. F. Schott

Christianity and Symbolism. By F. W. Dillistone. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955. 314 pages. $4.50.

This volume as reported by its author, the chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral, is a sequel to *The Structure of the Divine Society.* As readers of that book will recall, the "Divine Society" is the church, an institution like other institutions because describable in categories relevant to the social life of mankind, yet unlike other institutions, because it is "divine." This book is a study of Christian sacraments, which are symbolic and hence congruent with much of human symbolic behavior, yet different because they are Christian and not exclusively symbolic. The problem engendering this book seems to be this, How can one *explain* what sacraments are to twentieth century men? Dillistone has evidently previously tried and failed. At least he is not content to repeat his seminary rubrics any longer. This book is a most serious inquiry, though perhaps not without many shortcomings. In any case, the chancellor says that we must explain what sacraments are by exploring the nature of symbolic activity.

On the one side this book is a rejection of one mode of explanation. When people explain in terms of causes (as Aristotle conceived them), they explain something by reference to persons, to actions, to purposes. Sacraments are often explained by reference to their efficient cause, the agent of the action. God's intention, his conscious motive or end, is said to explain the sacrament. The author of this volume is not denying the truth of typical theological explanations of the sacraments, for surely theological explanation is of the type noted. His point is, I believe, that this theological kind of explanation does not "explain" to most men because they lack the confidence required. Nature is no longer teleological, a consequent of intention, a sign of grace or love. Twentieth century men do in fact describe nature, society, temporal relations, language, and personality in ways which do not require categories like lower and higher, the apparent and the real, good and bad. The cognitive understanding and explanation of nature and society does not enlist the habits, the modes of thought, the esthetic responses in which explanation by intentions, by wills, by powers can serve a widespread need.

There has developed in modern times another kind of explanation. It is not truer than the other but it is nonetheless different. We explain most frequently today by bringing a phenomenon under a law, or a law under a theory. Or we explain, it might be said, by exhibiting a phenomenon or an event or even a law as an instance of a wider generalization. The generalization is taken to explain the particular case. This latter kind of explanation does not appeal to a real and specific active being, but rather to the logical relations between a generalization and particular instances.

Mr. Dillistone's book, then, is a long look at human history and at sacraments. All kinds of generalizations are made about symbolic activity of men and how this has changed in the direction of what now obtains. These are historical generalizations about symbolic behavior. Then it is argued that sacraments are instances of symbolic behavior too. If human history is distinctively human because it is symbolically ordered, then we can be said to explain history in terms of generalizations about symbolic behavior. Rightly or wrongly, Dillistone's book is impressive here for its learning and for its interesting use of a wide variety of hypotheses and evidence. The probative values alleged here and there may, of course, be questioned, but somehow such considerations do not affect the main argument of the book. The crucial theses are not historical—they are rather those which aver that man is the symbolical animal, that men live in worlds made by their symbols. These are law-like statements. Sacraments are explained, but again not exclusively, by reference to them.

Obviously this book is not definitive. It is an attempt both to extend the field of knowledge concerning symbolic forms and to discriminate the logical relations obtaining

within that field. It seems to me that the author is saying that theologians have neglected this field of knowledge to their detriment. A few persons—Paul Tillich, Canon Quick, Gregory Dix, L. S. Thornton, T. F. Torrance among theologians, and C. Day Lewis and some of the contemporary poets and their critics—have already noted the importance of symbols in the humanization of man. But beyond this point, Professor Dillistone suggests, is the fact that this knowledge enables us to explain. Surely, the author is correct as to the importance of the field; but whether those explanatory logical relations are as logical and as explanatory —that is another matter. But it is about time that someone thinks hard about these issues again, and if nothing else, this volume does at least that. Actually, without being a definitive contribution to theology, the book does a lot more than that. How much more? For $4.50 and many hours of reading, you can find out.

PAUL L. HOLMER

Subject and Object in Modern Theology. By James Brown. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 214 pages.

Here is that wonderful word again, existentialism; and here is a volume in the excellent new series, The Library of Philosophy and Theology, which will stir up most of the hopes and fears beginning to crystallize in assessments of existentialism. Ministers and theological students who surely have profited by a study of Bonhoeffer's *Ethics* and Bultmann's theology in previous books in this series will find their time and money very well spent on this volume.

The author, a minister in Scotland, has wisely chosen a single standpoint—in this case the subject-object issue—from which to examine the thinking of four existentialists, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Buber, and Barth, with enough attention given to Tillich to make one wonder why he did not devote a chapter to him. Other interpreters of existentialism have chosen the perspective of freedom, of reason and faith, or of biblical authenticity. Brown's field of operation is at once immensely fruitful and exceedingly dangerous because the subject-object problem is a perennial trouble-maker in the history of philosophy. Furthermore, to deal adequately with it is to be involved in the enormously important and tricky related issues of ontology, the nature of time, and semantics, to mention but three. As one follows Brown's discussion, the feeling grows that he, too, is following someone's lead, and he frankly indicates this on page 86, where he writes: "I shall depend mainly upon a recent and an older work of exposition and criticism," H. J. Blackman's *Six Existentialist Thinkers* (1952) and John Cullberg's *Das Du und die Wirklichkeit* (1933). Brown has wrestled honestly with his problem, made it his own, and shared its results in a stimulating way. Generally well written, he permits at least five awkward pieces of grammar, an astonishing occurrence in British writing which usually is vastly superior in clarity and force to our own (pp. 107, 113, 141). How his editors allowed him to come out in print with "It seems to myself" (22, 84) or "in order to the articulation" (113) is past comprehension.

The perspective selected by Brown needs no defense: the subject-object relation is a persistent problem of epistemology, it is one which has become urgent in modern thinking because of the distinction between objective and subjective "thinking," and it is an issue since Kierkegaard constitutes a battlefield in philosophy, theology, the humanities, and the arts generally. The issues were given, in their modern setting, by Kant, who used the term "objective" to apply to the kind of knowledge sought in the sciences, i.e., in any knowledge of phenomena, and "subjective" for the view that a person has the ability to gain knowledge of that which goes beyond phenomena, as presumably our knowledge does in the ethical, aesthetic, and religious realms. Brown pursues only very briefly post-Kantian work on this subject, wishing to hasten on to examine the more dramatic developments of the problem at the hands of the existentialists. This probably is a mistake because it ignores much fruitful work in philosophy and leaves one with the final impression that the existentialists have not helped much. Have they?

Presumably Kierkegaard did when with

humor and zeal he burlesqued both the allegedly static, abstract, conceptualized notions of Hegel and his monstrous arrogance in implying, allegedly, that God, man, and the universe were finally explicable. "All the errors of Hegel," Brown writes, "according to Kierkegaard, arise from ignoring that thought implies a thinker, a concrete, individual, existing thinker" (p. 41). "Actual life is reduced to a shadow existence," Kierkegaard had said, and went on to establish "a new doctrine of Subject," that it is "a living, active, self-making, self-choosing, self-renewing energy . . . with its life in ethics, religion, and knowledge vitally affected thereby" (p. 45). With this crucial emphasis it is but a step to say that subjective thinking is "infinitely interested" thinking, that truth is something which persons bring to pass, and hence that "subjectivity is truth." So with immense intellectual sophistication Kierkegaard helped to father the anti-intellectualism of our day.

Heidegger's version of existentialism, though he dissociated himself from existential philosophy, advanced the notion that the subject makes itself: *Existence* is constituted by the relation of the self to its environment. The fundamental truth about life, moreover, is that it must die. Thus, whereas Kierkegaard and Heidegger agree on the importance of *choice* and on the insubstantiality of the self, they disagree radically on the status and knowledge of values. Bultmann, incidentally, can use Heidegger as a base of operation, however questionable this may seem to critics, but to do so he must emphasize the *believing* capacity of the self and the fact of God in "real" history. Comparing these three, one sees that it is imperative to realize that existentialism is a *way* of thinking, not a set of doctrines.

Buber strove with poetic power to delineate two *attitudes* of man to his universe, personal and impersonal, and to call men to the more valuable, existential, personal relation (encounter or meeting)—which is revelatory—with the "Eternal Thou" which can "by its nature not become It" (129). For Barth the Subject (with a capital S) is God, who as Buber said, can be known only existentially, never "objectively" save in the particular historic "self-definition of God before men," Jesus Christ. Truth—the most important or saving Truth—for Barth requires a faith-knowledge attainable only on the condition of trust, obedience, and total response of the Self to the divine Subject. So Buber's formula, *Ich werde am Du,* becomes in Barth *Am Du Ich werde.*

These pivotal elements, then—(1) thinking that is involvement (2) with the ultimate question of existence (3) by the whole person—characterize the existential approach. Schelling, Nietzsche, Bergson, Marx, and Jaspers also strove, as did the four giants studied here, to supplant the subject-object distinction with the view of man as a total personality, totally involved in knowledge at its highest, namely, his relation to an eternal Thou. On all this Brown has shed much light, not insignificantly by his many apt quotations.

A number of crucial problems are posed by this book; but that is the mark of an excellent book, that it be provocative as well as informing: this book is.

CHARLES W. KEGLEY

The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought. By John Baillie. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. 151 pages. $3.00.

Those who have learned to appreciate the balance, clarity, charm, and scholarship of John Baillie's books will welcome his most recent contribution to theology. This volume contains the revised and expanded Bampton Lectures delivered at Columbia University in July, 1954. Baillie set for himself the task of providing a rather extended review of the considerable body of recent thought and writing concerning revelation. He succeeds in doing for the topic of revelation what ought to be done for many cardinal doctrinal concepts. He distills from the independent theological systems or perspectives of the most substantial contemporary theologians that which can now be taken up into an ecumenical consensus with respect to the idea of revelation. In the course of his arguments he explores the characteristic themes of Barth, Brunner, Tillich, Temple, H. R. Niebuhr, Bultman, A. Farrar, Farmer, Cullman, Hebert, Buber, Thornton, Bonhoeffer, Dodd, and others. This exposition has as its historical background an analysis of the de-

velopment of the idea of revelation in Scripture, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, the sixteenth-century Confessions, Spinoza, Kant, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Hodge, F. D. Maurice, W. Herrmann, and others. Baillie's book is thus an exceedingly worthwhile essay in systematic, historical, and contemporary theology.

This book is not, however, a mere chronicle or collection of quotations. Baillie develops an independent line of thought which enables him to assimilate what is of positive value in the varied expositions of this subject at the same time that he suggests shrewd and cogent criticisms even of those scholars whom he most admires. The main points of Baillie's presentation will not be unfamiliar to readers of his previous books, but the particular context which he has chosen gives a freshness to familiar themes.

Baillie's general theological orientation gives the primacy to faith but includes reason as a necessary constituent of religion. He is in the line of Augustine, Anselm, Bonaventure, Pascal, Temple, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Tillich when he insists that faith, which he defines as trust or commitment of the will or heart, must seek expression in rational categories and submit to rigorous and comprehensive rational examination. This orientation enables him to do the work of a summarizer or reconciler.

Baillie's first chapter traces the history of the bifurcation of a traditional distinction. He describes the medieval settlement according to which revelation was conceived as a way of communicating a body of knowledge, some part of which could be independently obtained, while the remainder was supplemental. He then explains how the balance of emphasis between the terms of the distinction was upset by the rationalists of the Enlightenment, who placed almost the whole of their reliance upon reason, and by the early Reformers, who touched but lightly upon natural theology and based their systems almost wholly upon the revealed Word. Baillie affirms that the medieval formulation was misleading, even to those who challenged it because it asserted that what is revealed is information about God. In succeeding chapters he suggests that the watershed between earlier and more recent statements on revelation is provided by the recovery of the fundamental insight that it is not information about God that is revealed, but very God himself, incarnate in Jesus Christ. Revelation is disclosure of Subject to subject, and its content is "saving knowledge." In revelation God not only gives himself, but he reveals himself in action within history. Revelation is incomplete without the human response to God's initiative. Religion is, then, essentially faith, which is to be understood as trust, and as assent only in relation to the intellectual implications which are elaborated from Christian experience when the need for theology arises. Baillie is thus unwilling to agree to any simple identification of Scripture with revelation. He subjects mechanical inspiration to penetrating criticism, but affirms his belief in verbal inspiration, so long as it is not considered as plenary in nature.

In the course of his argument Baillie offers genuine clarification with respect to the nature of inspiration, the use of the Bible, the relationship of natural to revealed theology, and the theological basis of the ecumenical movement. The book ends with a highly personal and pointed sermon on the subject of the responsible recognition of and response to the Word of God.

HAROLD H. DITMANSON

Truth and Revelation. By Nicholas Berdyaev. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. 156 pages. $2.50.

This is an exciting, stimulating, and exasperating book. It really should be reviewed by one more thoroughly acquainted with Berdyaev's thought than the present reviewer. Then perhaps some of the exasperation at the verbiage would disappear. But even so, it is still to be devoutly wished that theologians who want to be philosophers (i. e., lovers of wisdom) should write with greater clarity and precision and not substitute flag-waving for rational communication. It is only so that the desired end, which is to distinguish between what can be understood and what cannot be understood, between what can be communicated directly from one person to another by means of ideas which have common referents and a

different kind of communication, can be established.

It is Berdyaev's purpose in the book, a sort of crown of all his previous writings, to give a critique of revelation itself, and to do so as a philosopher rather than as a theologian, but as a philosopher who stands within the circle of faith and has already been apprehended by revelation. This is an endeavor, therefore, quite similar to that of Emil Brunner in his *Revelation and Reason.* There are, however, significant differences between the two approaches and the conclusions arrived at.

Berdyaev is, according to his own assertion, an existentialist philosopher and a gnostic, one who gives a certain preeminence to "gnosis" or knowledge and therefore allows his reason somehow to be the final arbiter with respect to revelation. This accounts for his emphasis upon "freedom and the spirit." The sharp cleavage between creator-creature and the taking seriously of God's holiness and self-sufficiency, which are characteristic of the biblical revelation, disappear in Berdyaev's thought. Man is somehow necessary to God. "The question involved is the religious meaning of creative power and the human creative effort which God expects as an enrichment of the divine life itself. It is what may be called *the gnostic idea of creative power* [italics mine] and it has been the principle theme of my life and thought" (pp. 124-5).

Freedom, it would seem to me, rather than agape, is the dominant motif. "Does freedom belong to being over freedom or to freedom over being?" Berdyaev asks, and he asserts the priority of freedom, although it is not clear just what this is to mean. At any rate, it is this that causes Berdyaev to reject divine predestination and providence. While to reject them in the form in which they have sometimes been put is justification enough, there is apparent an unwillingness to allow the absolute sovereignty of divine love. It is for the same reason that Berdyaev rejects every trace of the penal aspect of the atonement and even the possibility of an eternal hell. "Belief in hell is disbelief. It is to have greater faith in the devil than in God. Hell is an exoteric idea" (p. 130). "The non-existence of hell is a moral postulate" (p. 134). It is therefore some form of apokatastasis, some sort of culmination in freedom in which God himself comes to fulfillment and from which nothing is excluded which God has made, to which Berdyaev looks forward. In this Berdyaev's gnosticism is clearly apparent, for here, as is characteristic of all gnosticism, he allows his reason to reject the presence of radical evil in the world. It is his reason, after all, which sits in judgment on the irrational elements which are simply given in revelation, the holiness and self-sufficiency of God, the presence of radical evil, the unconditional character of God's love, etc. This is curious in the light of Berdyaev's realistic estimate of the human situation and his recognition of the difference between a system of thought and the irresolvable tensions of existence. Perhaps a greater familiarity with the remainder of Berdyaev's writings would put things in a better light.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Pulpit Under the Sky. By Joseph M. Shaw. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1956. 250 pages. $3.50.

Probably no other individual has so influenced the course of Norwegian Lutheranism both in Norway and America as Hans Nielsen Hauge. While Hauge and his work have been well known in Norway and among Norwegian-speaking Americans, there has been a dearth of material about him in the English language, and no previous attempt has been made at a full-length biography in English.

This biography is therefore most welcome. The author was reared in an American Lutheran community sympathetic to the work of Hauge. After graduating from St. Olaf College and Luther Theological Seminary he used his opportunity as a Fulbright scholar in Norway to prepare the material for this biography. Mr. Shaw makes no pretense at having written the final word on Hauge. He has, however, seen the need for just such a book as he has written.

Hauge conducted his work in Norway at a time when rationalism was threatening the spiritual life of the church. Under the conviction of a divine call, he became the great lay leader and preacher who more than any

other individual helped to preserve orthodoxy in Norway. The picture of Hauge which emerges from Shaw's biography is not that of a fanatical or highly emotional religious leader. Rather it is the picture of a young man who lived close to the Word of God and through the result of religious influences in his life became convinced of the need of bringing to others the same joy and peace which he had experienced in fellowship with Christ. He carried out his work in a simple, straightforward manner, but in doing so aroused the opposition of some factions within Norway. His steadfast and patient endurance of imprisonment and a prolonged trial move one to admiration.

To one who is not familiar with Hauge's work, Shaw's biography is exciting reading; to one who is familiar with Hauge's work, the biography gives satisfaction for its objective, dignified, yet effective presentation.

Hauge was never a systematically trained theologian. He was moved to preach by his knowledge of the Word of God and his feeling of compulsion that the message of salvation in Christ should be preached to the people. The simple directness of his message is revealed in the translation of some of Hauge's writings which are appended to the biography. This is one of the valuable features of the book. A careful reading of Appendix II is particularly rewarding.

HERMAN A. LARSEN

The Church and the Public Conscience. By Edgar M. Carlson. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956. 104 pages. $1.75.

For some time the discussion of Christian political responsibility, of a Lutheran conception of the structure of society, and of the calling of the individual within that structure has been moving toward a climax. In this brief book, the president of Gustavus Adolphus College has provided a lucid and in many respects definitive statement of the consensus that has been reached. What other writers have been pointing to, he has here stated with clarity and forthrightness.

The book stands well within the main configuration of discussion. Some have indeed described the ethical task differently, and President Carlson has taken account of them (cf. pages 23-25, references to both Orthodoxy and Pietism; also *passim*). But no one has kept so well within the familiar landmarks of Lutheran theological and ethical writing, bringing all the major doctrinal insights to bear. Nevertheless, this book is not just a routine restatement and summary of agreements reached. Written with refreshing theological imagination (see the discussion of the relation between creation and redemption), it is at the same time definitive and forward-looking.

President Carlson's book is an example of the real function of theological work within a tradition, namely, that of a creative reformulation of the meaning of doctrines, freeing them from the restrictions of particular times, places, and philosophical commitments. Thus, by liberating the doctrine of creation from the restrictive paraphernalia of Orthodoxy, the author uses it to lay a strong foundation for conscientious Christian social action. Similarly, he frees the two-kingdom theory from its not infrequent bondage to the status quo. The constant emphasis of the book on an order that rests in creative freedom, furthermore, frees political thought from the kind of culture-bound theorizing too characteristic of it in the past. The treatment of order and coercion is, in addition, a brief but effective answer to Künneth's over-emphasis on *Ordnung*.

Briefly put, the book sets the ethical task in the continuity of creation and redemption. The church is the custodian of the Law as well as of the Gospel. On the basis of the law the church may and must speak to the state and to the other orders, calling and recalling them to their proper tasks, so that within the world as given to man the Gospel may flourish. For the individual the Christian calling becomes a mediating role through which created order and redemptive motivation are bound together in his life. By stressing the first use of the Law, the writer can define the purpose of the state as the achievement of that kind of order and justice within which the Gospel may work effectively for the redemption of man. Thus the orders have not only a negative task in the prevention of social disorder but a positive role in preparing men for their final destiny. (Carlson raises some pertinent questions about the autonomy of the orders in

this context; p. 78.) Thus, beginning with the structures of society, Carlson defines the tasks of both state and church within the framework of God's continuing creative act and everlasting redemptive concern.

In his final chapter Carlson reviews his discussion in the light of the Evanston Assembly. This reviewer finds it a little difficult to see this chapter's organic relevance to the preceding rounded treatment and suspects that some of its optimism is more personal than characteristic of the Lutheran community. But perhaps this simply reveals that here is the point where full and vigorous debate is most needed today.

Be that as it may, no Lutheran should hereafter discuss Christian social responsibility without taking this book into account. Every Lutheran layman and minister who wishes to speak intelligently as a Lutheran should study this little work carefully. Taken together with George Forell's book on Luther's social ethics (*Faith Active in Love*), Carlson's work demonstrates that Lutheran ethical discussion has achieved maturity on the American scene.

KARL H. HERTZ

A Christian in Politics: Luther W. Youngdahl. By Robert Esbjornson. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison & Co., 1955. 384 pages. $3.50.

It was almost a foregone conclusion that a book of this sort should be written. The reawakened Christian concern for public life and the renewed discussion of vocation make the biography of a Christian in politics a natural undertaking.

Such an undertaking is, in addition, a necessary one, for political decisions almost always involve socially complex, morally ambiguous situations. Here the simple logical application of *a priori* principles is impossible; action flows from concrete individual responses embodying insight and foresight, integrity and expediency. Thus politics as a vocation cannot be studied apart from political events; the *leitmotif* of a career is the cumulative effect of a succession of decisions, of affirmations and negations that grow into policy, of directions chosen which begin to define developments, perhaps even to shape institutions.

Since Luther Youngdahl has been on the scene on several occasions when important issues were moving toward critical decision (gambling investigations, discriminatory practices against Negroes, the Lattimore case), the study of his career has value for the Christian who is politically concerned. Since, in addition, Youngdahl has enjoyed many headlines (both in the daily press and in religious journals), his career gains in importance.

Unfortunately neither the form nor the substance of this book does justice to the issues involved. Such unity as the book possesses tends to be elementary and primarily chronological. There is an introductory section of Christian principles which by its very brevity never gets beyond a schematic statement of alternative positions. Presumably Youngdahl's career is an illustration of one of these, but the relation seems purely mechanical.

Organizationally we never get a sense of organic unity nor of logical development. The Lattimore case is probably intended to be the climax of the book; certainly the author indicates clearly enough Youngdahl's preference for the bench rather than the governor's chair. Is the political vocation of the Christian, therefore, primarily judicial? or is the *leitmotif* of a political career independence? The author does not really clarify the relationship between Youngdahl's political career and his Christian convictions. In view of the book's avowed purpose, what is uniquely Christian about being honest and brave and passing judgment according to the law even under political pressure? Surely one could expect no less of any judge worthy of his place on the bench. Examples of political excellence of this kind can, moreover, be found in the history of Rome and Greece, in the careers of humanists and pagans. Can one indeed say that Youngdahl's motivation and career as here portrayed go beyond a pious concern for decency in public life and a certain courage born out of Christian commitment—no minor virtues indeed, but ones that grow out of the general Christian calling to sanctification rather than out of the particular vocation of politics?

The criticism of organization has quite naturally become a criticism of substance.

Here one feels that exploration in more theological and psychological depth, a deeper awareness of the complexities and ambiguities of political existence, a fuller painting of the political and social context in which this career unfolded itself (including an awareness that other political leaders in other states were facing the same situations) —these would have helped probe to the heart of the issue. The arguments adduced for Christian participation in politics do point to a unique Christian motivation (by faith we are set free to serve our neighbors) but not to a unique Christian role.

In setting down these criticisms, we must be fair to the author. For the evidence seems to indicate that neither his subject, Youngdahl, nor the Minnesota churches, ever articulated a position on politics beyond the elementary espousal of decency in public life. One gets the feeling, moreover, that the support of the churches was largely on moralistic grounds; no company of prophets evidently arose to speak with clarity and conviction on race relations or in defense of the Lattimore decision.

We are, therefore, left with the basic questions unanswered. Can one define a uniquely Christian role in politics? Or is the sole Lutheran contribution the motivation of the Christian? What place does the criterion of competence have? If the church is the custodian of the Law as well as of the Gospel, does the application of the Law extend beyond a rather simple moralism in public life?

Such questions as these, left unanswered and probably not answerable in terms of the subject of this book, are the reasons why it fails to do justice to its avowed purpose. With all its shortcomings, however, it merits approval for blazing a new trail in the study of Christian social ethics. Indeed, it marks the beginning of a new kind of Christian biography and thus the creation of a body of literature from which in time we may gain political wisdom and insight.

KARL H. HERTZ

Old Priest and New Presbyter. By Norman Sykes. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956. 286 pages. $5.00.

"The historic episcopate" was point four of the well-known Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888. Every approach toward unity with the Church of England promptly runs into it. The present ecumenical movement cannot ignore it. Hence this book is timely.

The author is professor of Ecclesiastical History at Emmanuel College, Cambridge University. The chapters of the book are lectures delivered at the universities of Edinburgh and Birmingham. They discuss "Episcopacy and Presbyterianism since the Reformation with especial relation to the Churches of England and Scotland." The result is a history of Anglican adherence to episcopacy in the fluctuating historical scene. Though written with sympathy for the Anglican position, the treatment is not an apologia for it, and it appears to be critical of the Anglo-Catholics. The author is more interested in historical accuracy than in party spirit.

Such a study makes no claim to originality. Its distinction rests upon the fact that it brings together in compact form the essence of the Anglican discussions since the Reformation. The narrative is based upon primary sources which are quoted profusely. There is no bibliography, but the footnotes indicate the broad scope of the research involved.

The author sets forth the varied Anglican interpretations of episcopacy beginning with the Elizabethan period and continuing through the current union developments in India, where a willingness to broaden the definition of episcopacy is evident.

The book enables readers outside the Church of England to understand what seems to be an Anglican obsession with polity. Its scholarly treatment is fair to non-episcopal churches, though it reads too much episcopal sympathy into Lutheran writings.

W. D. ALLBECK

Religion in Crisis and Custom. By Anton T. Boisen. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 271 pages. $4.00.

The author, well known as a pioneer in the field of clinical pastoral training, has a rich background in both sociology and abnormal psychology as well as a theological training. These various disciplines are

brought to bear upon the underlying motivations and dynamic development of the sects providing a unique insight and objective understanding of their real nature.

The objectivity of this careful researcher is lacking in most clergymen when they attempt to study or discuss the sects (or even denominations other than their own) because of the temptation to labor under strong preconceived notions and defensive mechanisms. One gets the secure feeling that this scholar drew his conclusions honestly from the findings that his surveys, interviews, and other methods of analysis produced.

The most telling chapter is the one entitled "Economic Distress as Social Crisis," which shows how the Pentecostal sects arose to meet a specific need in a way that the more established churches seemed unable or unwilling to do. In a curious book, *The Exploration of the Inner World,* the author had shown how mental illness is actually a definite effort on the part of an individual to meet a personal crisis. His thesis in *Religion in Crisis and Custom* is that the development of sects and deviant religious groups is a similar attempt to deal with the great social pressures and maladjustments of the group. Surely this provides a new dimension for church history as well as for the contemporary study of church bodies, synods, and even parish splits.

The development of the Methodist Church from a deviant sect to the position of a major established denomination is cited as a kind of sociological case study. This method sheds light by comparison upon a deeper understanding of other denominations as well. In fact, the inference is drawn that this is a rather natural kind of leveling off process that takes place in any religious group. Custom tends to conserve the values of certain experiences and forms by institutionalizing what was once a spontaneous effort to deal with a crisis. When new crises arise, the highly institutionalized structure is not flexible enough to adapt to the pressing and immediate need, so other sect groups must arise to answer the need and meet the challenge. Naturally, the critical question suggested is whether or not a church can really be all things to all men.

A careful reading of this book will make members of the established denominations less censorious of the rising sects by helping them to see their role in bringing the sects into being. This is the kind of creative book that not only opens up large horizons but stimulates further research to clarify, verify, or at least expand upon the hypothesis it presents.

DAVID BELGUM

Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts. Edited by Emil Sehling and continued by the Institute for Evangelical Church Law in Göttingen. Vol. VI, Part 1. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955. 697 pages. DM 50.

The monumental collection of sixteenth century German church orders, begun by Emil Sehling in 1902 and left incomplete because of economic conditions during and after World War I and because of Sehling's death in 1928, is now being carried forward again under the able direction of Ernst Wolf and Rudolf Smend. The first fruit of this revived activity is the present volume which covers the orders of the principalities of Wolfenbüttel and Lüneburg and the cities of Brunswick and Lüneburg to the close of the sixteenth century. Many of these were never before published or were published only in extracts (notably by A. L. Richter). The painstaking task of reproducing manuscript and printed texts of the sixteenth century and of furnishing the texts with essential annotations has been well done, and the new publisher has given the volume a handsome dress which conforms with the earlier volumes in typography and format.

The importance of this continuation can scarcely be overestimated. Those who have made use of them know that the church orders are not merely liturgies (a common misapprehension) but are usually extensive documents which include instructions for parish visitations and the organization of churches and congregations, directions for the maintenance of properties and the conduct of schools, regulations concerning doctrine and worship, marriage and divorce, the care of the sick, the poor, orphans, etc. In other words, the whole life of churches in the sixteenth century is reflected in these documents. Consequently every encourage-

ment should be given not only to their publication but also to their use.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

The Religions of Mankind. By Edmund Davison Soper. Third edition, revised. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 253 pages. $3.50.

This comprehensive one-volume survey of the religions of mankind joins scholarship with clarity of expression. A wealth of detail is skillfully organized into a vivid and fascinating story. While it is an excellent text for undergraduate or theological students it is no less valuable for the general reader who desires a graphic account of the development of man's religious beliefs and practices. Following each chapter are "Suggestions for Further Study," indicating books of value in each field.

HJALMAR W. JOHNSON

Principles and Practice of Preaching. By Ilion T. Jones. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 272 pages. $3.75.

The author has been professor of Practical Theology at San Francisco Theological Seminary since 1945. He is a Presbyterian and has served a number of churches of that denomination. He also directed Presbyterian student work at the University of Iowa. His long and varied preaching experience helps to account for the common sense approach to his subject. There is nothing new, nothing spectacular advocated. Principles, not rules, for sermon preparation and delivery are offered. They would be accepted by the great majority of effective preachers today. There is room for adaptation to varied personalities and methods of work. Dr. Jones indicates his preferences but does not dictate.

There are five sections on the background of preaching, planning the sermon, preparing the sermon, preaching the sermon, and building up a reservoir for preaching. There are several chapters under each section. If the treatment of Dr. Jones's book seems negative to this point, it is not to detract from the value. For beginners in preaching as well as for those with years of experience, this is a useful book. In clear analysis the whole process of sermon construction and delivery is outlined. Extensive quotations from published books in this field, book lists at the close of each chapter, and a very exhaustive bibliography at the end add to its worth. The author's basic approach to preaching is that it must do more than proclaim the Word. In preaching the work of Christ is "prolonged, not merely proclaimed."

The Gospel is a spiritual possession and demands good stewardship of words. Heart, mind, and voice must witness persuasively through the sermon. From this approach to preaching Dr. Jones proceeds to outline the steps, one by one, involved in bringing a sermon idea to maturity and form for the pulpit. He believes in expository preaching, clear outlines, journalistic style with generally short sentences and the vocabulary of the hearers, varied sources of illustrations, and earnest manner of delivery. Dr. Jones's own style is excellent and his book is easy reading.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

The Great Invitation and Other Sermons. By Emil Brunner. Translated by Harold Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 188 pages. $3.00.

Emil Brunner is perhaps best known in the United States as a theologian and a professor of theology. This volume presents him as a preacher of outstanding ability. It consists of twenty-two sermons preached in the cathedral church of Zurich. The student of these sermons is impressed at once with two marked characteristics.

This preacher, one immediately observes, deals with vital themes. Here is no surface scratching, no clever dressing up of trivialities for popular approval. The great truths of the Christian faith are set forth and applied in the sermons. The preacher recognizes his obligation to "feed the flock of Christ" and spreads before them substantial portions of the bread of life. Each title could be cited in evidence of this sense of the important. Apparently Dr. Brunner feels that preaching is an urgent business and applies himself earnestly to the task of making God's truth live for the hearers.

Complementing this characteristic is the other, the simplicity of the preacher's presentation. He offers substantial food. But it is

so prepared that all the flock may partake of it. The preaching is deeply theological, but the thought is developed with clarity and with an appreciation of the thought processes of those who occupy the pews. The reader of these sermons cannot fail to be impressed by the manner in which they carry him along step by step, making the truths seem almost inevitable. There is little by way of illustration. Rather the development of the thought itself is illustrative. When the preacher has finished his presentation of some great theme the hearer is apt to say, "That is exactly what I have wondered about, and now I see." This is to say that the preaching of this volume deals with the great timeless themes of the Christian religion satisfyingly. Theology is interestingly and instructively preached.

Every sermon in this collection contains some insight, some unfolding of thought that invites comment. Especially noteworthy to this reviewer were the first sermon in the book, "Lord is it I?" the sermon on the church, "The Rock on which the Church is Built"; the Communion sermon, "The Meaning of the Last Supper"; and the Easter sermon, "Death and Resurrection," which incidentally was preached five weeks after Easter—for a purpose.

Naturally a Lutheran turns with some interest to a sermon by Brunner on the Last Supper. He finds this theologian saying that St. Paul, when he describes the institution of the Last Supper, "is not thinking of a merely memorial feast." He follows with interest the preacher's development as he draws the distinction between "magic" and "miracle" in the believer's participation in the sacrament. He notes such affirmations as: "Here we have a miracle but no magic. Magic means the transmutation of the bread and the wine by the utterance of the priest; but miracle is the presence of Jesus Christ, making his own into a unity, into one body. Thus the sacrament of the Last Supper is truly a miraculous event, but not a magical event. The miracle consists in the creation of a believing community of which Jesus Christ himself is the indwelling Spirit and Guide." And one feels that here is preaching which opens up the Scriptures and feeds the soul.

Credit should be given to Harold Knight for the excellent translation which seems to capture the spirit of the preacher and represent him faithfully in good readable English.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

Wedding Addresses. Compiled by Julius W. Acker. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. 168 pages.

This is a collection of thirty-three brief wedding addresses, each by a different pastor of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

Weddings often have degenerated to fashion parades, with more concern for the social niceties than for the abiding presence of Christ. Some weddings attract hosts of pagans who might not otherwise blunder into a house of God. Granted that the ground may be unusually rocky and thorn-infested, the seed ought to be sown, although because of the high-flown state of the wedding couple, we ought not to depend on the wedding address as our all-sufficient and sole program of marriage guidance.

The personal opinion of the reviewer is that a few of these wedding addresses read as though they were lacking in imagination. Since there is apparent in each address the concern and love of a pastor's heart, it is most likely that in their spoken delivery, they were still effective because of their earnestness.

A. C. RUETER

Sermons on Marriage and Family Life. Edited by John C. Wynn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 173 pages. $2.75.

"From nearly 400 sermons submitted to a special committee of the Joint Department of Family Life in the National Council of Churches, these sixteen were chosen to show what Christian preachers are saying to challenge, comfort, and guide families in the complex situations of modern life."

The editor, John C. Wynn, is director of the family education program of the Presbyterian (U. S. A.) Board of Christian Education. He did the preliminary screening of the hundreds of sermons submitted. Final decision regarding the sermons to be included in the book was made by the editorial

committee appointed to carry through the project on behalf of the Joint Department of Family Life which planned this volume. "The purpose throughout," we are told, "has been to present useful material for ministers and others interested in the church's preaching ministry to families."

From the Introduction we learn that the "word *sermon* is emphasized because this book is not intended to be a collection of essays or treatises. It is planned instead as a means of sharing Christian messages that have proved helpful and stimulating to congregations across the land." The reader has a right to expect a most interesting experience. He will not be disappointed. Many tired preachers will find the contents just right for use and an easy "transplant," and some of the illustrations will be diligently filed away for future employment in some new surroundings. We dare hope that many more will study the volume with great care. Rich rewards wait for those who examine the structure, style, content, and movement with a critical eye. Seldom is a finer opportunity presented than just here to evaluate the homiletical art, for seldom do so many write on a single aspect of life at any given time. Probably nowhere else can one examine so profitably the contemporary sermon-structure and status of theological learning. Here, after all, is gathered together a wide assortment of "preaching greats" who in many instances are prodigious contributors to sermonic materials. And perhaps at no point is a man so challenged to bring all his learning and experience to bear as when asked to speak and write about the home.

THEODORE HEIMARCK

The Sacramental Table. Addresses by Representative Scots Preachers. Edited by George Johnstone Jeffrey. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 153 pages. $2.50.

Much of the material in this book is more directly relevant to the Lenten theme than it is to the subject of the Lord's Supper. The most serious criticism that might be offered is that the authors have relatively little to say about the sacrament as such. There is not too much here to portend the realization of Dr. Harold Fey's wistful hope, recorded on the jacket, that "this little volume . . . will bring a long-awaited awakening in American Protestantism to what the Lord's Supper should mean to us and do for us."

Though the entire book is hardly cause for rejoicing in a new-found unity of Protestants on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, this is nonetheless a significant collection of sermons, very much worth reading. If the men who have written them are truly "representative Scots preachers," preaching is on a high plane of excellence in Scotland. The reader will find much to justify Dr. Fey's characterization of the book as "weighty with great Christian preaching." The best known contributor is James S. Stewart. It is eloquent testimony to the high quality of the book as a whole that his typically fine sermon is not "in a class by itself."

LOWELL O. LARSON

Adventures in Christian Stewardship. By R. C. Rein. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955. 100 pages, paper covers. $1.00.

In the preface to this book the author says of these stewardship studies: "They lend themselves for use in Bible institutes, seminars, stewardship schools, Bible classes, and for private and family study." They do a commendable job of being equally valuable for any of these purposes. The eight chapters (with discussion questions at the end) sketch the whole field of stewardship from a Lutheran point of view. From the first sentence of the book "Why do I live?" on through to the end of the book, each page is thought-provoking.

The chapter entitled "The Stewardship of Body and Mind" is unusually refreshing. The chapter on the stewardship of time is pointed and well done. In answer to the complaint of many that they have no time the author says, "The fact is that God has given all the time there is. This is one gift we all share alike. And it is a gift that we lose if we do not use it."

CLYDE J. GRIMSTVEDT

Billy Sunday Was His Real Name. By William G. McLoughlin, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. 325 pages. $5.50.

This book is much more than a biography of William A. Sunday. It is a study of the whole "revival tradition" in America, and it places that tradition in the framework of the entire social, political, economic, and intellectual history of our country.

The author bases his biography of the sensational evangelist upon wide research in hitherto unused sources of information, including numerous interviews with Mrs. Sunday and many other associates and contemporaries of Sunday, both friendly and critical. He presents an amazing array of statistics and details of factual information, all thoroughly documented, but through it all he paints a vivid and lively portrait of the man who was born in a log cabin, reared in an orphanage, became a major league baseball star, and then turned to preaching and led more than a million people to "salvation" down the saw-dust trail.

This is the most scholarly and analytical study of a great American revival that has yet been made. It proceeds on the theory that revivals are not merely outbreaks of mob hysteria or mass hypnotism, nor merely the creation of skillful evangelists. They are not simply the results of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, or supernatural intervention in the eternal conflict between the powers of righteousness and the forces of evil. Revivals can be understood only as products of their times. The mass revival of Billy Sunday was "an emotional upheaval growing out of special circumstances peculiar to Sunday's day and age." The result of this premise is that the reader of this volume is constantly reminded of the changing American scene during Sunday's whole life.

Billy Sunday is thoroughly demythologized here. His methods are set forth in detail and analyzed in each stage of their development. The reader learns how "the whole temper of religious revivalism was gradually transformed from one of intense but reverent excitement into the superficially contrived enthusiasm and strident heartiness of a political convention." It is shown that Sunday changed his positions on public issues from time to time to suit the whims of each new time and place. "He had only to give vehement and colorful expression to the prevailing mood to achieve nationwide fame and success." Sunday owed much to other revivalists for his methods, his ideas, and even his sermons, but he was unique in the degree of his sensationalism and in his increasingly commercial and secular approach to revivalism.

Much of Sunday's success was due to the fact that he came on the scene just as many churches and ministers were beginning to despair of their future and had begun to resort to pulpit sensationalism. After the close of World War I this situation changed, and Billy Sunday's star began to decline. Sunday's career extended over forty years and covered forty states. He conducted more than three hundred separate revival campaigns. They cost many millions of dollars and enlisted the cooperation and attendance of many millions of people. In the end "Sunday lost touch completely with the public temper" and his mass evangelism through tabernacle and saw-dust trail gave way to the more steady methods and the more enduring results of visitation evangelism.

Dr. McLoughlin views the entire career of Billy Sunday in perspective and finds little or no balance on the credit side of his mass evangelism. Nevertheless, "Billy Sunday's career deserves an important place in the religious history of America. . . . He won recognition and fame precisely because he embodied so accurately the cultural pattern of his era." The book contains eighteen pages of bibliography and analytical "Notes on the Sources."

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Modern Rivals to Christian Faith. By Cornelius Loew. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. 96 pages. $1.00.

The Significance of the Church. By Robert McAfee Brown. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. 96 pages. $1.00.

These two books are the first in a series of small volumes entitled the "Layman's Theological Library." In the Foreword to the series, Robert McAfee Brown, editor and associate professor of Theology at Un-

ion Theological Seminary, New York, says the books will try to "remind the layman that he is a theologian, . . . for theology is not an irrelevant pastime of seminary professors," but rather "the occupation of every Christian the moment he begins to think about, or talk about, or communicate, his Christian faith." The purpose of the series is not to prepare a "layman's theology," but rather to communicate the faith in such a way that it might be more relevant, more understandable, and that the layman might commit himself to more than "religion in general." To such a noble intention this reviewer shouts "Hurrah!" The whole series will probably be worth purchasing on the merits of its intention alone.

In the first book, *Modern Rivals to Christian Faith,* the author goes right to the heart of a new form of an old problem—idolatry. Instead of taking us to a pagan country to view the shrines and "graven images," he unearths within the pattern of contemporary American culture a number of "secret" or hidden gods. Defining religion as that to which "we give our loyalty, commitment, and devotion," Dr. Loew discovers three such unacknowledged gods in science, democracy, and "America the beautiful." Because of the apparent success of these enterprises, and in light of the insecurity of our times, many persons, inside and out of the Christian church, are tempted to give their full devotion to these "hidden gods." He does not belittle science as a means to controlling environment, or democracy as a method of political organization, or patriotism as an expression of unity. But too often these are "overinflated," and the strong pull is to worship the human creation instead of the Creator.

In the second part of the book, Dr. Loew uncovers a number of the "idols" within the church, and he does not limit his remarks to statuary in the Roman churches. In fact, he does not even mention them. But he does mention "justification by faith" in its twisted man-centered contemporary interpretation, "bibliolatry," "denominationalism," "making the most of yourself Christianity," and the "faith in human goodness" that has infiltrated our religious life so effectively that it is almost a part of the Christian tradition. In one chapter he eliminates both the "positive" and the "negative" aspects of popular Christianity, namely, Norman Vincent Peale and Billy Graham; the former because he is guilty of putting man in the driver's seat instead of God, the latter because he is "just the kind of person Norman Vincent Peale tells us we can become," and both because they are unaware of the dangers of our "secret gods." The book concludes on a note that is most welcome: laymen are invited to return to Christian theology, involving disciplined thinking and holding views that have sharp edges.

The second book in the series is a small book with a big topic. *The Significance of the Church* is rather hard to cram into 96 pages even if the book is designed for laymen, especially when its readers will be found in a number of traditions within the church. However, as the author states in the Foreword, "this one attempts to pull together . . . some of the things that Christians, standing broadly in the Protestant Reformed tradition, have believed about the church." He begins with a "long hard look at the church" by both the "outsider" and the "insider." If there is any complaint about this chapter, it might be that the look is not as long, or as hard, as it could be. At one point, in describing the plight of the "outsider" and his need for "community," the author has a very interesting paragraph on the cocktail party as a secularized version of the Lord's Supper. He concludes this chapter by stating that "in a world where people feel so lost and alone that they eagerly desire community, it makes sense once more to talk about the Christian community. And the existence of a particular community—the church—may be more significant than we have realized."

The author then goes back to "the most decisive event in the life of the church," the Protestant Reformation. With a few remarks on Luther and his struggle, he proceeds with an "exercise in vocabulary," including such phrases as "justification by faith," "the priesthood of all believers," "the authority of the Scriptures" and attempting to interpret their meaning in words that laymen might comprehend.

Reaching farther back into history, the

author describes the "call of Abraham" as the moment when "the Jewish people were called into a self-conscious community" and out of which the Christian community later came into being. Using the hymn, "The Church's One Foundation," as an outline, he defines the church with a further exercise in vocabulary, i.e., "Body of Christ," "Bride of Christ" ("Feminine readers will not like this figure very much, because it is the symbol of obedience"), "People of God," etc. In the rest of the book he deals with the Protestant-Roman Catholic issue, the "shared life" of the church, and its particular task. In the final chapter he deals with the need for a continuing reformation in the church in light of the recurring temptations: to confuse itself with God, to irrelevance, to perpetuate division, and to be fashioned by the world. And then, in smaller print (to remind us that we still need reformation), he lists as signs of hope: the theological revival, the ecumenical movement, the fresh voice of "younger churches," prophetic movements within the church, and the new emergence of the layman.

In light of the purpose of this series, I would say the "Layman's Theological Library" is off to a good start.

James H. Hanson

Religion on the Campus. By George Hedley. New York: Macmillan, 1955. 194 pages. $2.75.

A Lutheran pastor reading George Hedley's *Religion on the Campus* should do two things: first, forget that these are sermons and, second, start at the back of the book. If approached from the reference of biblical, exegetical preaching, these sermons delivered at the chapel of Mills College in Oakland, California, would come under some severe criticism. Approached, however, from the reference of a college chaplain attempting to answer some of the questions brought to him by a cultured, somewhat sophisticated community of faculty and students representing the spectrum of theological conviction, there is much that gains approval.

The question for the preacher is one of communication. He knows that he is dealing with members of the academic community whose hearing of the Christian Gospel is often blocked by prevailing presuppositions. "It is impossible to 'be scholarly about religion.'" "Being religious is going to church on Sundays." "Prayer is trying to get something from God." "The Bible is an old-fashioned book for the old-fashioned." "The church has nothing really sound to say about marriage, social problems, and other questions better learned by academic study." "A minister can not possibly understand my problems." These questions and hundreds like them add up to a conviction or suspicion that the church has outlasted its usefulness in our day of enlightenment.

Chaplain Hedley tries to do what every good campus pastor tries to do. He lovingly accepts the student as he or (more likely in this case) she is with all her questions. He knows that only the person who takes the question seriously will be listened to for an answer. Usually, however, the campus pastor is in contact with his students on this discussion, counseling basis during the week. On Sunday mornings he has the opportunity to declare God's answers to life's questions in his preaching. This, of course, is what every good pastor is doing as he lives with his people in all their problems during the week and declares the Gospel in the form of preaching on Sunday morning. The two can never and should never be kept completely separate, but in combining his counseling and preaching, Dr. Hedley often finds that he has not gotten to the Gospel message *per se*.

This would certainly be the reader's reaction to the first section of sermons here. The subject is "religious" in the broad sense of values. This is an emphasis badly needed where there is no place given to values. It is useless to talk of the truth of Christianity when this category of truth is unreal to the hearer.

The same is true to a slightly less pronounced degree of the second section on "Some Student Problems." Most of these are answers to submitted questions, and much time is spent in accepting and clarifying the question and then in attacking other possible answers so that often there is little time left for a strong Christian answer.

The third section deals with "Some Questions of Theology." And knotty questions

they are for the honest student: the devil, sin, death, the death of Jesus, or the descent into hell. They are the kind of questions which very often overcome a young person who has grown up assuming that just about everyone else, especially other Christians, believe exactly as he does on those questions of theology. Dr. Hedley does not attempt to spell out the details of these doctrines but rather deals with their essential meaningfulness. As such, he establishes his points less on biblical revelation than on human logic. His logic, however, includes mystery and wonder for the things we do not know and must accept on faith. This is a valid reminder that our Christianity is based on faith and not scientific facts. Again, many students reject Christianity because it is presented as facts in a biblical textbook rather than faith which God gives through his Word. The writer of this review has presented a sympathetic analysis of *Religion on the Campus* because he believes in what Dr. Hedley is trying to do. He approaches his task differently than a Lutheran would do it. This does not mean that there is not much for us to learn.

The value of the book is chiefly in the insights into the kinds of questions which members of the academic communities are asking. They are questions which bother most students and which often are ruled out of bounds within the church and therefore go unanswered. The book will help any pastor with students in his congregation to establish valuable contact with his own students. The Lutheran pastor will want to declare a good deal more to the student than Dr. Hedley often does, but he will find here much that is helpful. The book will also serve as a warning that we need to go further with our students than the rational answers or half-answers with which they easily become content.

OTTO A. BREMER

A History of Modern European Philosophy. By James Collins. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1954. 854 pages. $9.75.

The history of philosophy is a relatively new discipline. It is only within the past 150 years that it has become a separate and methodologically organized endeavor. All kinds of claims are made about it still, perhaps none so extravagant as that which supposes that the history of philosophy is the way to become philosophical. The latter appears to be the tacit view of most institutions of learning. With the German philosophers and historians of the nineteenth century two extremes came into view: on the one side there grew up an ambiguous notion that any philosophical view was justified by its antecedents—almost to say that its genesis was its proof or at least that the reason for believing a view lay in its antecedents in time; later the opposite became apparent, viz., that philosophical views were also relativized by their history and, once shorn of their truth claim, were instances of unverifiable but important cultural-historical believing. What seemed to promise the cessation of doubt then became the occasion for it. Anyone who has taught the history of philosophy can easily discover, if not what the historicists said, at least the apparently accidental fact that the succession of doctrines presented to students in a history of philosophy course is sometimes given as the reason for a pervading skepticism about the whole enterprise of philosophizing.

Mr. James Collins is a professor committed both to the Christian faith and to Thomistic philosophy. This is, I believe, his first textbook, though he has written several other worthy books too. He has not chosen to write a history which says that the later is justified by the earlier. Nor has he conceived philosophical doctrines as mere opinion. Above all, he has broken with the convention so apparent in many religious circles —and not least the Catholic—of writing a manual on "how everybody is wrong except us." Mr. Collins' history gives the strongest possible case for twenty philosophers from Bacon and Hobbs to Bergson and Nietzsche. His volume serves very well the endeavor of confronting Thomists with the vital argument in philosophers who intentionally departed from the Aristotelian tradition. Thus instead of construing them by their errors, Collins construes them by their strengths.

As observers of American religious his-

tory well know, the Roman Catholic Church decided early to consolidate its position in this country by a voluntary kind of isolation. Its seminaries and learning have suffered a kind of provincialism that is reprehensible. Mr. Collins' book is the kind of American Catholic scholarship which is the sign, I believe, of the lively future in store for the Catholic Church in this country. This book is the work of a careful, somewhat pedestrian, but very concerned, teacher of philosophy. At every step he knows what he wants, what philosophers can say, what one can expect of them religiously, etc. He is not shocked by Nietzsche; he is not anxious to prove that any one of the philosophers was a Catholic or should have been. If the gates of hell will not prevail against the church, then a few philosophers are probably not going to slay the Almighty either—this seems to be his conviction. Always it seems to be the argument and its validity which interests Professor Collins. If anything is noble and in the spirit of Thomas, this is.

This book is an indication of what American Catholicism can become. It is an aggressive piece of scholarship, not defensive or uninformed. Anyone who can write such admirable annual surveys of philosophical movements as Mr. Collins has for *Thought* (the quarterly coming from Fordham) can do little else but an informed job on modern philosophy. Mr. Collins is the kind of scholar whose work commends itself, not because it is Catholic only, but also because it is of obvious scholarly quality. When Catholic scholars can do this they are in admirable position to discredit the view that Protestants still seem to cherish about them—viz., that independence of mind and honesty and ability are not cherished within the Roman communion. But, in the spirit of the New Testament, if all things are ours as Christians, then Lutherans, too, can rejoice in Mr. Collins' book.

No one can write 854 pages without saying many things deemed doubtful by others. The dove-tailing of contemporary interests —logical positivism, G. E. Moore's analysis, Wittgenstein, pragmatism—into a vigorous kind of analytic philosophy seems to me to have deserved some space, perhaps in fact that devoted to Bergson. The case for the new physics and non-teleological judgments about natural phenomena could have been more vigorously stated too. The entire empiricist movement fits this new kind of explanation of actuality almost like a glove does the hand. Thereafter philosophy has to have a point of departure other than the explanation of things. And T. H. Huxley and others who have exaggerated the significance of the study of consciousness as the feature of modern philosophy have, nonetheless, noted an important feature. Somehow this gets lost in the volume. An occasional summary of not only the individual philosopher but also of the relations between philosophy and science, a philosopher and other philosophers, might have allayed this.

This book does not replace Harald Høffding's *History of Modern Philosophy,* nor recent German works. It does provide the most up to date and most easily accessible bibliographies on the respective philosophers which I know about. Collins' book is a text, but a very good one. It is expository, mildly critical, and dreadfully complete. Without admitting the strains and stresses encountered by traditional supernaturalism, this book shows exceedingly well how modern philosophy occasions criticism of it. Certainly a Lutheran pastor can be informed by that kind of book too.

PAUL L. HOLMER

Christian Words and Christian Meanings. By John Burnaby. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. 160 pages. $2.50.

One of the crucial areas of Christian concern at the present time is that of communication, making the Christian Gospel intelligible to modern pagan man completely cut off from his Christian heritage. There is an increasing awareness that there is a distinctive body of Christian words with a meaning that is known only to Christians, who have experienced that to which these words refer. Words are conventional, agreed-upon symbols and have many and constantly changing meanings. The words of the Christian vocabulary are also used by non-Christians in a variety of ways. Some of the time-hallowed words have been spoiled by

long association with strange bed-fellows; they have become freighted with connotations alien to their original intent. While there are some who, therefore, advocate the coining of an entirely new vocabulary not so freighted, there are others who deem it wiser simply to try to define the old words that have come down to us in their specific Christian meanings.

John Burnaby, regius professor of Divinity at Cambridge University and dean of the chapel at Trinity College, is to be highly commended for these lucid definitions of sixteen of the most important Christian words in their Christian meanings, discussed in pairs, such as faith and knowledge, revelation and dogma, etc. The author's style is clear and challenging. It is to be devoutly hoped that he will get a wide hearing. Particularly gratifying is the primary definition of grace, not as a power infused, but as "the free and unmerited favor of God," God himself in his unconditional turning to the sinner and acceptance of him. But this act of gracious acceptance is not divorced from the freedom and the new life it imparts.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

The Existentialists and God. By Arthur C. Cochrane. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. 174 pages. $3.00.

This book contains the lectures delivered by the author—a Canadian at present occupying the chair of Systematic Theology in the seminary of the University of Dubuque, Iowa—as guest professor of the Robert Foundation Chair of the Philosophy of Religion and Christian Ethics at Presbyterian College, Montreal, during the fall semester of 1954.

It grew out of the author's conviction "that the central and basic problem for theology today is that of distinguishing between the various concepts of being held by existentialists inside and outside the Church and the Christian doctrine of the being of God revealed in Jesus Christ" (p. 7). Thus it treats of the views of Kierkegaard, Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger, Paul Tillich, Etienne Gilson, and Karl Barth.

In so far as it is possible to do justice to the views of these men in such brief compass, the author is helpful in distinguishing concepts of being arrived at speculatively from that which is pointed to in revelation. The author writes as an enthusiastic Barthian and comes competently to the defense of his master.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

Luther Discovers the Gospel. By Uuras Saarnivaara. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951. 146 pages. $1.95.

This is a self-assured, militant, formidable book. In it Dr. Saarnivaara takes on the entire squad of modern Luther scholars single-handed and offers to clear up the confusion over the meaning and the date of Luther's "discovery of the Gospel."

He begins by sketching a contrast of Augustine and the mature Luther on justification. "Augustine means by justification the renewal or gradual transformation of man into the image of God. Luther understands by it the forgiveness of sins, the imputation of righteousness for the sake of Christ" (p. 14). The "Augustinian-Catholic" view brought Luther into despair because he could never be sure that his own transformation was proceeding satisfactorily.

Through Staupitz, however, "the light of the Gospel began to shine" into his heart. The vicar helped him to break through the Augustinian-Catholic "retributory order of salvation" and to understand repentance, atonement, and predestination. Through Staupitz' mediation, Luther experienced an initial conversion in 1512. He was enabled to "believe in the forgiveness of sins in Christ. But he did not realize that thereby he was also justified before God. He was unable to identify the forgiveness of sins and justification" (p. 45).

What was begun in 1512 came to culmination much later. Assuming that Luther's 1545 preface to his Latin Works describes his crucial discovery of the Gospel, Saarnivaara asserts: "the 'tower experience' of Luther was his discovery of the full Reformation insight into justification, that God justifies the sinner by graciously imputing, or reckoning, the merits of Christ to him as his righteousness. Justification is not a change in man, but the gracious declaration of God by which He pronounces righteous the sinner who in himself is not righteous"

(p. 46). In other words, the tower experience hinges upon drawing a sharp distinction between justification (the instantaneous declaration of full forgiveness) and sanctification (the gradual renewal which is its fruit).

With this criterion established, Saarnivaara proceeds through Luther's early writings to determine when this new insight first appeared. He finds that Luther broke out of the Augustinian-Catholic conception of justification first in the sermons on threefold righteousness and on twofold righteousness. The tower experience, therefore, took place late in 1518. "Thus we have been able to establish the date of Luther's discovery of the evangelical insight into justification from the testimony of two sets of documents: (1) From the direct references of Luther in his preface of 1545 and his statements in his table talks, and (2) from the fact that his Reformation conception of justification appears the first time in his writings in the autumn and winter of 1518-19. The testimony of each of these sets of documents is quite conclusive in itself. The fact that both of them point to the same date makes the result doubly reliable" (p. 108 f.).

This is an impressive argument, apparently well grounded, closely reasoned, and adequately documented. Nevertheless, I think it is basically unreliable. For this reason the book deserves more than a review. I had hoped for a time to write a detailed reply, but I have not been able to get to it. Hence I must complete my original assignment to review it, simply indicating where the defects seem to me to lie.

1. Saarnivaara's view of the mature Luther's position on justification is highly debatable. Therefore, it is a dubious starting-point for a book on how he got that way. If the issue between the mature Luther and Augustine were as clear-set as Saarnivaara alleges, then Luther ought to have been more careful than he was to distinguish between *reputare justum* and *efficere justum*. Again, he ought to have repudiated Augustine more decisively; actually, he continued to appeal to Augustine as corroborating his insight into the righteousness of God (see *WA*, 5:144—cited here on p. 99—which quotes "Spirit and Letter" chapter 11, as did his scholion on Romans 1:17 in the Romans commentary; again, see *WA*, 43:537). One wonders if the statement early in the book, "in reality, Lutheran Orthodoxy understood Luther quite correctly," is not the author's presupposition as well as his conclusion.

2. The claim that two sets of documents doubly prove the 1518 dating of the tower experience is doubly debatable. The 1545 preface is a veritable quagmire of problems. Whether Luther intended it as a chronological, autobiographical account at all is still a question. How much weight can be laid on such expressions as, "I felt that I had been reborn and had entered paradise," is another question. Stange has remarked recently that Luther used similar expressions of other experiences; he concludes that the tower experience and Luther's Reformation discovery are two different things. Furthermore, Luther's descriptions of his tower experience speak simply of an insight into the "passive righteousness of God." Saarnivaara has to argue that this insight in itself cannot have been an epochal discovery; he has to include with these words the imputation doctrine—and not just that doctrine in itself, but in a particular new form and context. Something like a sidecar on a sidecar on a motorcycle. He establishes these further implications by a single subordinate clause of Luther's which indefinitely qualifies his commendation of Augustine. This is highly unconvincing to me; other interpretations of Luther's preface are at least possible.

3. The other set of documents, Luther's early writings, seem to me to present no such conclusive case as Saarnivaara claims. I think he reads into the sermons on threefold righteousness and twofold righteousness a much sharper break in Luther's thought than the text warrants. (a) Luther's language after 1518 continued to be much more fluid than Saarnivaara's. Such terms as *"efficere justum,"* or retribution categories, or "grace and gift" (which I think Saarnivaara misinterprets), etc. are not nearly so neat in the mature Luther as in Orthodoxy. (b) Luther's language before 1518 was not so homogeneously "Augustinian-Catholic" as Saarnivaara finds; otherwise he would

hardly have been condemned in *Exsurge Domine* for several views which he had developed before 1518. (c) Saarnivaara makes a great point of not being misled by first appearances when it comes to the terms "justification" and "imputation"; but he is not nearly so careful where other idea-complexes are concerned. To imply that Luther's conception of Law and Gospel did not change between the early Psalms lectures and 1518 is simply misleading. To treat Luther's term "theology of the cross" before 1519 merely as monastic humility-piety is unbelievable. (d) I fail to see how Saarnivaara can properly treat the justification question in Luther's development as something self-contained, apart from other crucial developments during these early years. In addition to Luther's growth in interpreting Scripture, which Saarnivaara does discuss, I would mention the question of Christology, the attack against Aristotelian ethics, the attack against Scholasticism, the reinterpretation of "spirit and flesh," the *simul justus et peccator"* theme, and the question of personal certainty of faith. All of these have a considerable bearing on Luther's developing comprehension of the Gospel.

4. To describe the "Augustinian-Catholic" view of justification as a doctrine encased in a "retributory order of salvation" may have merit, but it is a modern statement of the situation, not Luther's. This is not what Luther seemed to find in Augustine. As I have said, he continued to appeal to Augustine for support against his Roman Catholic enemies. Meanwhile, it simply will not do to assert that "modern exegesis agrees rather unanimously" that Luther is correct and Augustine wrong in interpreting the Pauline teaching on justification; it does not, Paul Feine (1903) to the contrary notwithstanding.

5. Saarnivaara's claims on the position of Staupitz are extravagant. It seems questionable to call the result of his advice to Luther a "conversion." More questionable yet is the assertion that Staupitz was free from the Catholic "retributory order of salvation"; Ernst Wolf, the editor of Staupitz, shows that he was not.

6. The way Saarnivaara deals with modern Luther research does not inspire the greatest confidence. He records an imposing bibliography. However, he never comes to grips with many of the major authors in it —Erich Seeberg, Rudolf Hermann, and H. J. Iwand, to name a few. In citing some scholars, he occasionally leaves an entirely misleading impression, as for example when he quotes Wendorf (p. 73) and Thimme (p. 117). Most astonishing of all is this haymaker: "no earnest effort has ever been made to ascertain the meaning and content of this [tower] discovery" (p. 39). The truth is, no problem in the modern Luther Renaissance has received more concentrated attention, until Ernst Wolf could remark in 1933 that controversy over the dating and evaluation of the tower experience was dying down, but not because unanimity had been reached.

What shall we say to these things? I confess I am not in a position to solve the problem how and when Luther discovered the Gospel. Saarnivaara has made me reconsider some notions which I had regarded as fairly assured. Nevertheless, for the reasons I have cited above, I continue to doubt that Saarnivaara has solved the problem either, that he has a right to impugn the method of practically all recent Luther research, and that he represents "the full Reformation Gospel of Luther—and of Scripture."

ROBERT H. FISHER